THE

LABOUR MONTHLY

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

Editor : R. PALME DUTT

Volume 18 · April, 1936 · Number 4

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

PROBLEMS OF LABOUR POLICY
R.P.D. AND OTHERS

On the Knife Edge
AITKEN FERGUSON

Tom Mann
ALLEN HUTT

Easter Week, 1916
PAT DEVINE

Book Reviews

PRICE SIXPENCE

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

★ MANIFESTO ★

The urgencies of the day, the many claims that are made on the time and brains of those who are looking for some way out, impel us to choose our books only with the greatest care and to be certain of one cardinal point—that they will not lead seekers after truth into the bogs of turgid and undeveloped thought on subjects of importance to all of us.

It is a question of degree. A Niagara of books may be impressive: they may fall from the printing presses in such quantity that the would-be reader is dazzled and seduced by the very profusion in which they tumble around his head. But quantity is not enough, odd though that may sound.

It may be a misguided idea on our part to suppose that quality is important and that the capabilities of the author do, in the long run, matter; but, misguided or not, that is our story and we are going to stick to it.

Lawrence and Wishart have hitherto been operating independently. The system had its advantages, of course, but they were outweighed by the many disadvantages. There was overlapping; a narrowness of range imposed by economic considerations; unnecessary dichotomy of function.

Our marriage will, in our opinion, do much to help the reader, who can be certain that the name "Lawrence and Wishart" on the spine of a book is a guarantee that the pages inside are not written by an amateur with parlour ideas of his own foisted on the public as socialist thought, but are a practical and accurate contribution to constructive socialism.

We do not claim an absolute monopoly of good socialist books, but we do claim that we publish no book which is not in fact, as apart from intention, socialism. Got that?

In fact, we go so far as to publish a monthly paper called *The Eye*, in which we take the trouble to recommend all constructive socialist works published by other firms. We recommend *The Eye* to you.

SPRING LIST . . . . .

LENIN'S SELECTED WORKS (12 volumes, 5s. a volume). Publication begins on April 6th.

DIALECTICS: THE LOGIC OF MARXISM AND ITS CRITICS. T. A. JACKSON. 10s. 6d. (April). Comparable, in its sphere, with Dutt's *Fascism and Social Revolution.*

BRITAIN WITHOUT CAPITALISTS. Possibilities of Socialist Industry in Britain. By a group of experts, with an Introduction on Planning. 8s. 6d. (May).

REVOLT ON THE CLYDE. WILLIAM GALLACHER, M.P. 10s. 6d. (end April).

EASTER, 1916. MONTAGU SLATER. 2s. 6d. (April) This play from the Left Theatre production comes appositely on the twentieth anniversary of Connolly's execution. We are also publishing *Easter Week*, an historical booklet by Brian O'Neill. 2s. (April.)

FRANCE (title to be decided later). RALPH FOX. 5s. Immediately after French elections.

TOM MANN: An Appreciation on his 80th birthday. DONA TORR. 6d. (April.)

CHINA'S RED ARMY MARCHES. AGNES SMEDLEY. 5s. The "Ten Days" of the Chinese Soviets. (Summer.)

Three Novels:—MAY DAY, John Sommerfield; THE COOLIE, A. M. Anard; MAN CHANGES HIS SKIN, Bruno Jasilnski. Each 7s. 6d. (end April). A book of Verse, POEMS OF STRIFE, Julius Lipton, with an Introduction by C. Day Lewis, 3s. 6d. (April); and of Cartoons, THEY FOLLOW THEIR LEADER, 3s. 6d. (May).

NEW MEN—NEW TIMES. By STALIN AND STAKHANOVITES (Martin Lawrence, 5s.).

Recently Published:—

BRITAIN AND THE SOVIETS. Verbatim Report of the Congress of Peace and Friendship with the U.S.S.R. Bernard Shaw, Sidney Webb, R. Boothby, M.P., etc., etc. 6s.

MARXISM AND THE NATIONAL AND COLONIAL QUESTION. J. STALIN. 5s.

POVERTY OF PHILOSOPHY. K. MARX. 5s.

PROLETARIAN LITERATURE IN THE UNITED STATES: An Anthology. 7s. 6d.

AMERICAN WRITERS' CONGRESS. 6s.

LETTERS FROM PRISON. GEORGI DIMITROFF. (6s. and 2s. 6d.). With Victor Gollancz.

MILITARISM AND FASCISM IN JAPAN. (Cheap Edition.) 5s.

STAY DOWN MINER. MONTAGU SLATER. 2s.6d.

★ **LAWRENCE & WISHART LTD.** ★
***Publishers,* 2 PARTON ST., LONDON, W.C.1**

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

VOLUME 18 APRIL, 1936 NUMBER 4

Editor: R. PALME DUTT

CONTENTS

Notes of the Month - - - - - - - Page 195
THE LABOUR PARTY DISCUSSION
By R. P. D.

Problems of Labour Policy - - - - - „ 206
By R. McKINNON WOOD, T. D. SMITH, JOHN MORRIS AND LEONARD WELLS

On the Knife Edge - - - - - - - - „ 214
By AITKEN FERGUSON

Tom Mann - - - - - - - - - „ 221
By ALLEN HUTT

Easter Week, 1916 - - - - - - - „ 227
By PAT DEVINE

The Problem of African Independence (*Concluded*) „ 237
By H. RATHBONE

Book Reviews - - - - - - - - - „ 250
Revolution and Freedom of Ideas - - - *By* Montagu Slater
A Human Reforging - - - - - - - *By* Tamara Rust
Wanted a Signpost - - - - - - - - *By* D. G.

The Appeal Fund - - - - - - - „ 255

Published at
7 JOHN STREET, Theobald's Road, LONDON, W.C.1.
A

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Labour Monthly

Editorial and Publishing Offices :
7 JOHN STREET, LONDON, W.C.1.
Telephone : HOLBORN 6656

¶ The Editor of *The Labour Monthly* invites contributions. He cannot, however, be held responsible for MSS. sent to him or undertake to enter into correspondence regarding rejected contributions, although every endeavour will be made to return the same when a stamped and addressed envelope for that purpose is enclosed.

1936 : *Subscription Rates*
[PAID IN ADVANCE]

British Isles :

One year - 7/- Six months - 3/6

Abroad :

One year 8/- or $2.00 Six months 4/- or $1.00

American Subscription Representative :—Philip Novick, 270 Broadway, Suite 1401, New York City, U.S.A.
South African Representative :—I. Wolfson, P.O. Box 5457, Johannesburg, Transvaal, South Africa.
The Labour Monthly is also obtainable wholesale from The Workers' Bookshop, 38 Clerkenwell Green, E.C.1.
Advertisement Rates : £8 8s. od. per cover page and pro rata. £5 5s. od. per page (ordinary position) and pro rata (⅛th page minimum).

BOUND VOLUMES

Volume I	£5 0s. 0d.	*Volume X*	15s. 0d.
Volume II	£3 3s. 0d.	*Volume XI*	15s. 0d.
Volume III	£3 3s. 0d.	*Volume XII*	10s. 6d.
Volume IV	£3 3s. 0d.	*Volume XIII*	10s. 6d.
Volume V	£2 2s. 0d.	*Volume XIV*	10s. 6d.
Volume VI	£1 10s. 0d.	*Volume XV*	10s. 6d.
Volume VII	£1 10s. 0d.	*Volume XVI*	10s. 6d.
Volume VIII	£1 1s. 0d.	*Volume XVII*	10s. 6d.
Volume IX	£1 1s. 0d.		

Loose copies of last five volumes can be exchanged for a bound volume for 4s. 6d. Single loose copies are available of almost every issue since 1921.

The articles in *The Labour Monthly* are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

World Issues—Labour's Choice—Labour Party Discussion—From 1931 to 1936—MacDonald's Ghosts—What Must be Done? —The Path of Tom Mann—Towards a Class Party—Unity and Leadership—Life and Death Issue for Labour Party—Programme Questions—For a Programme of Action—Democratise the Constitution.

WORLD events underline the significance of the present discussion by Labour Party members on the future of the Labour Party. For, although the tendency is still marked to a limited " British " outlook, as though electoral and parliamentary politics could continue their jog-trot indefinitely, " in an island cradle curled," shut off from the hurly-burly and the desperate issues facing the wider world, there are increasing signs of an awakening. Since the discussion began, we have had the Government's re-armament programme, preparing the militarisation of British economy ; Hitler's Rhine coup and denunciation of Locarno, marking the next step forward in the scheduled programme of Nazi war-preparation ; and the Japanese murder-coup, preparing the further offensive of militarist aggression in the Far East. Against these rising war-forces, we have had the ratification of the Franco-Soviet Pact ; the electoral triumph and developing offensive of the People's Front in Spain ; the advance of the Chinese People's Front, rallying the masses over extending districts to the united national struggle against the imperialist invader ; and the firm stand of the Soviet Union against the Japanese threat to Outer Mongolia.

IN this rising world battle, which extends in a hundred varying forms through every country, where does British Labour stand? Do we stand with the mass struggle, with the Soviet Union, with the United Front, with the People's Front, against the fascists, the militarists, the National Government and the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war-makers? Or is the Labour Party to be only "His Majesty's Opposition," the polite counterpart and safety-valve of the National Government, acclaiming the need of "national defence," as in Attlee's speech, applauded by the entire capitalist press; acclaiming Baldwin as one who "speaks for the nation," as in the *Daily Herald* after the King's death; calling for "justice" for Nazi Germany and approval of Hitler's policy of peace in the West and war in the East; tenaciously opposing working-class unity in Britain and internationally, and thus wrecking the world front at its most critical point in the centre of imperialism and smoothing the path of reaction and war? This and nothing less is the issue involved in the present discussion. Let us beware of a too narrow approach, as if it were only a question of the relations of the Labour Party and the Communist Party, of the immediate electoral and parliamentary tactics of the Labour Party, or of the next items in the Labour programme. All these are only expressions of a deeper issue, of a basic issue of direction in the present world situation and British situation. *To any complacent narrowness of outlook history will give a terrible answer.*

IN the series of contributions we have printed from Labour candidates and others in the present discussion, there is a visible sense of the urgency of the position, of the lack of any clearness or effectiveness of policy, drive and leadership in the present situation of the Labour Party, and of the need for change if a victorious advance is to be achieved. This outlook is not peculiar to the present discussion. Similar expression can be heard wherever the situation of the Labour Party is discussed among supporters. It is unfortunate that the central organs of the Labour Party give no scope for such discussion of the problems and policy of the Labour Party by its membership. But in the local labour press a number of discussions of great interest have been taking place. Notable have been those in the Birmingham *Town Crier* and in the Rotherhithe *Labour News*. Throughout, a similar note is sounded. Thus, in the series of rank-and-file contributions in the discussion entitled "What is Wrong with the Labour Party?" thrown

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

open in the Birmingham *Town Crier*, we find the demand that the Labour Party should " attack more," should " cease to fear its friends and apologise to its enemies," should give up " heresy-hunting " ; there is complaint of " apathy," that " apathy comes from the top, apathy is due to lack of leadership, and to vagueness " ; that the membership " have little opportunity for voicing opinion on policy " ; that there is a " distinctly unhealthy influence of large contributions, whether from individuals or societies." The Rotherhithe *Labour News* for January, 1936, has put forward a fighting programme, reproduced in D. W. Flanagan's contribution in last month's issue, and calls for " unity—leadership and struggle through unity." These are the demands sounded throughout the local labour movement. First, unity : unity of all the working-class forces in the Labour Party. Second, a fighting programme and stronger attack against capitalism and the National Government. Third, democracy in organisation, finance, choice of candidates and formation of policy. These are the demands of the workers to the Labour Party leadership.

WHAT is the position ? As one contributor has pointed out, the Labour Party has not yet recovered from the consequences of the blow of 1931. There is very far-reaching truth in this. The policy of MacDonald, which was imposed on the Labour Party in contradiction to its original class-basis and carried through in the face of the opposition of the left workers and Communists, ended in bankruptcy in 1931. During the years 1921-1931 the fatal choice was made between unity with MacDonald, Snowden and Thomas, representing the policy of co-operation with the bourgeoisie, and unity with the Communists, representing the policy of the class struggle. The former were chosen as the true friends of the Labour Party ; and they insisted on and carried through the expulsion of the Communists. To-day we see the outcome in the merciless experience of facts. MacDonald, Snowden and Thomas stand with the enemy against the Labour Party ; the Communists fight side by side with the Labour Party, for the interests of the working-class and for unity against capitalism. Yet has

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the lesson been learned? MacDonald has gone; but has the spirit of MacDonald gone, has the policy of MacDonald gone, has the *damnosa hereditas* of MacDonaldism been wiped out? Not yet. The lesson of 1931 has never yet been frankly faced. And therefore the evil shadow of that inheritance of betrayal and bankruptcy still hung over the Labour Party in 1935 and prevented victory.

THE ghosts of MacDonald still sit in the high places of the Labour Party, and carry on his poisonous testament of heresy-hunting, parliamentary doctrinairism, denial of the class struggle and denial of working-class unity. The old policies are no longer carried on with the same confidence by the present leadership, who find themselves torn between conflicting dilemmas; they are carried on in a confused, discredited, half-hearted fashion; and the only effect is to create for the general population the impression of a vacuum of leadership and policy in the Labour Party, of a general vacillation, vagueness and helplessness, which damps the spirit of supporters and destroys the possibility of building up confidence in a future Government of such a party from the mass of the population. This was the situation in 1935, when the National Government won, not by its own popularity, but through the weakness of the Labour Party. An analysis of the General Election issued by the Home Counties Labour Association has shown that of the 552 seats contested in 1935, 221 revealed a lower Labour vote than in 1929, 84 seats won by Labour in 1929 were not won in 1935, and that, taking into account the increase in the electorate, "the Labour Party is, even with the 1929 aggregate vote, further off a Labour majority government than it was twelve years ago in 1923."

WHAT must be done to change this situation? The contributors to the discussion put forward a number of suggestions. Do the suggestions, taken as a whole, go far enough to meet what is needed? We believe there is still a tendency to under-estimate the basic change that is needed. The basic change for which 1931 sounded the warning and gave

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the signal, the reversal of the engines from the fatal track of MacDonaldism, has still to be consciously carried through in the whole spirit, character and basis of the Labour Party if it is to survive. What is that basic change ? First and foremost, put simply, it is that the Labour Party should become in its whole organisation, policy and leadership a united class party of all the workers, or rather (since there is not and cannot yet be the clearness of programme for the Labour Party to fulfil the rôle of the ultimate class party of the workers) the coalition party of all the working-class forces for rallying the entire working class against the ruling capitalist class on every issue. On this basis, and on no other, will the Labour Party rally the mass of the working class, and therefore the majority of the population (for the majority of the vacillating intermediate strata will swing with a strong, united working class) against the ruling *bloc* of the bankers and trust magnates, represented by the National Government.

THAT was the original conception of the Labour Party, however incompletely and with whatever confusions expressed, of its early founders, of a Keir Hardie, and even earlier, of a Tom Mann—whom we rejoice to greet this month on his glorious eightieth anniversary as the greatest pioneer of the British Labour Movement, as the living model of true leadership and fearless loyalty to the working-class struggle, this hero of the workers whom a MacDonald and his kidney dared to seek to expel from the movement, and who to-day still in our midst points the way forward for the whole working class ; may he live to see the unity of the British workers realised, marching forward along the path of united class struggle, which will alone lead to the victory of socialism. This was the path from which MacDonald and all he stood for turned the Labour Party aside, so that instead of advancing from elementary, embryonic class-consciousness to true and powerful and clear-seeing class-consciousness, it sank back into the bog of liberal defeatism and the status of a second-rate capitalist party. From this bog the workers must fight to rescue

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Labour Party, and to make it in truth their own party, the party of the workers' unity in the fight against capitalism.

THE path of MacDonald or the path of Tom Mann? That is the heart of the choice before the Labour Party. The one is the path of petty liberal-reformist heresy-hunting, driving out working-class fighters, bowing to the bourgeoisie, snatching at dirty capitalist honours. That is the path which leads to the contempt of the working-class and of all sections of the population for this aspect of the Labour Party, and the consequent inevitable "apathy" complained of on all sides and defeat at the polls, when the Labour Party goes ominously downwards in the big industrial centres which should be its stronghold, and advances only in the "backward" areas where the young, enthusiastic socialist candidates are sent to fight the hopeless seats. The other is the path of great and glorious working-class solidarity and unity, marching as a single army in strikes and in elections, openly as a class army against the class enemy, and on this basis sweeping all before it. Why did the overwhelming Labour votes, counterbalancing the losses elsewhere, arise in the mining areas in the 1935 election? Because there the class issue was open and unconcealed; the fight against the National Government candidates was no polite classless discussion of rival political theories, it was the fight for bread, the fight against the hated exploiters, and every National Government candidate was damned before he opened his mouth. Every election, every by-election has taught the same lesson. In the moments of high mass struggle, in the General Strike (Hammersmith), in the great February unemployed struggle last year (Wavertree), the Labour vote has shot up as at no other time; in the periods of parliamentary apathy and reformist heresy-hunting it sinks. The fortunes of the Labour Party rise and fall with the class struggle. That is the secret for the future of the Labour Party. But that secret is not yet understood by the Labour Party leadership, who thereby condemn themselves to impotence and ignominy, and prefer the second-rate rôle of imitation capitalist statesmen, laughed at behind their backs by the capitalists, to the glorious rôle of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

class leaders of the rising proletariat, hated and feared by the capitalists.

WHAT must be done to realise this change ? The first elementary step is to sweep away all discriminatory regulations against working-class fighters in the Labour Party and carry the affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labour Party. The question of Communist affiliation to the Labour Party is still in general too narrowly understood, and discussed as an isolated issue, of especial concern to the Communist Party. But the real problem is the problem of the Labour Party and its transformation to a united class basis. This and nothing less than this is the significance of Communist affiliation to the Labour Party. The Communist Party is the symbol of the class struggle, to which it has remained true through all. The victory of Communist affiliation to the Labour Party means the victory of the principle of united class struggle in the Labour Party ; and from this all else will follow. The Editor of the Rotherhithe *Labour News* is a hundred times right when he declares :

> The unity of the working class has been presented as a matter of simple arithmetic (x millions of affiliated members of the Labour Party plus y thousands of Communists). If that were so, we might conceivably agree with the official Labour view that those odd thousands of Communists could safely be left outside the Labour Party.
>
> But unity is not a matter of x plus y : it is a matter of leadership. To-day it is a matter of leading the workers and such allies as they can find in the struggle against war and fascism.

" Unity is a matter of leadership." That is a true and a pregnant sentence. Shall the Labour Party, or shall it not, stand for and carry out the line of united class struggle against capitalism ? That is the real issue.

SIMILARLY in an interesting contribution this month, Leonard Wells explains the standpoint of a Labour Party member, who does not agree with the Communist Party, but who desires its inclusion and also its autonomy to express its viewpoint within the Labour Party, in order to strengthen

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Labour Party, not merely in numbers, fighting enthusiasm and unity of the working class, but also in the formation of policy and leadership. A similar point is made in the very valuable contribution of the Secretary of the University Labour Federation. This is a very important point. That the Communist Party has a contribution to make, and is capable of making a contribution, to the urgent problems of policy and leadership of the Labour Movement, every sincere working-class fighter will agree. Several contributors, including those who declare themselves sympathetic to the Communist Party, complain that the Communist Party has made "mistakes." Undoubtedly every party makes mistakes. But there are mistakes and mistakes. Take every major issue since the foundation of the Communist Party. Take the perspective of the economic decline in Britain since 1921. Take the General Strike and the nine months of preparation for the General Strike. Take the analysis of the rôle of MacDonald, Snowden and Thomas as leaders of the Labour Party. Take Mondism and its fruits. Take the world economic crisis (on which the Labour Party leader, Dalton, laments in his recent book on "Practical Socialism in Britain," with reference to the formation of the Second Labour Government in the summer of 1929: "Could we have foreseen the coming of the trade depression . . . . but no one foresaw it then, not even the experts"—he omits to mention that the Communist International in the summer of 1929 specifically predicted it). On every one of these issues who made the mistakes? The Labour Party critics or the Communist Party? In view of this record a little more modesty on the part of some of the critics in pointing out "mistakes" would not be amiss. The question of the affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labour Party is not only a question of numbers, or of unity, but also of leadership. The entry of the Communist Party into the Labour Party will mean new life for the Labour Party. Then and then only a future opens out for the Labour Party, in place of the inevitable fate of German Social Democracy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN the next place, the question of programme will have to be considered. The existing "programme of action," entitled "For Socialism and Peace," may be many things, but it is not a "programme of action." It is imbued throughout with the MacDonald spirit of denial of the class struggle; its atmosphere of tepid liberal philanthropy bears no relation to the realities of the year 1934, in which it was actually adopted; its voluminous range of measures and reforms makes no attempt to centralise the fight on the burning issues of the working-class struggle and of the people's struggle in the period immediately in front. Is there any reason to expect for it a better fate than that of "Labour and the Nation," of which Dalton writes in his book already quoted, with reference to the Second Labour Government:

> The first King's Speech omitted nearly everything which had been included in the programme drawn up, specifically with a view to this situation, by the Executive of the Parliamentary Party only a few months before. It was a mere travesty of "Labour and the Nation," even if we exclude as impracticable in the circumstances all large measures of socialisation.

But it is the whole meaning of a vast, characterless "omnibus" programme that it makes it possible for the "practical" men to treat it like this when the time comes. Snowden boasted in office that he had never read "Labour and the Nation." How many of the membership of the Labour Party have ever read "For Socialism and Peace?"

IN the discussion on the programme since the general election two tendencies have shown themselves. One tendency, represented by Cole's "Limited Socialism with Social Reform," is in full retreat. This approach is based on an analysis of the supposed impossibility of a "purely proletarian" majority in the existing class structure in Britain (set out more fully in this author's "Simple Case for Socialism," p. 247); hence the Marxist line is held to be invalidated; and there remains only a watered-down liberal reformism. There is here evidently a failure to understand the Marxist theory of the hegemony of the organised class-conscious section of the pro-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

letariat, at the head of all the exploited masses, constituting the overwhelming majority of the population ; the theory which finds practical expression at the present stage in the closely associated tactics of the united working-class front and of the People's Front. From this failure, which is in fact equivalent to surrendering the majority of the population into the hands of the tiny minority of exploiters, follows inevitably the surrender of the programme to capitalism. In reaction against this tendency arises the alternative tendency among some left elements to demand a programme of "pure socialism," "uncompromising socialism," etc. But while the desire for a stronger fight here revealed is correct, this is not the path to its realisation, but rather to the increased doctrinaire separation of the Labour Party from the masses. The mere paper re-affirmation of the aim of socialism in the Labour Party programme will not in itself change the situation or bring the Labour Party one inch nearer to the class struggle, which is the real issue. As against both these tendencies, the real task of the new Programme of Action must be to express in bold and concrete form the burning issues of the mass struggle against capitalism, fascism and war, both in Britain and in the international field. The details of such a programme, capable of rallying the widest majority of the nation, require to be worked out on a broad, united front basis by the co-operation of all militant elements in the Labour Party, and a united fight could then be carried forward throughout the Labour Party for its adoption.

FINALLY, the question of organisation, which, as always, is the expression of political issues. It is urgently necessary to democratise the whole constitution, organisation and practical working of the Labour Party. The undemocratic anomalies of the existing constitutional system of the Labour Party, gross, patent, known to every one, are as thick as the anomalies of the British Constitution, one might almost say, the British Constitution before the Reform Act. Talk of "pocket boroughs!" A Labour Conference is a veritable system of "pocket boroughs," with few delegates directly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elected by the workers on the basis of the issues before the Conference. The scandals with regard to choice of candidates and finance are not creditable to a serious democratic body. The power of "the machine" is the despair of sincere and zealous Labour Party supporters. Letter after letter has been received by this journal in connection with the present discussion from very well known supporters of the Labour Party, who declare their sympathy with the changes needed in the Labour Party, but feel it hopeless to attempt to write their opinions, because they despair of ever changing anything with the existing system of the Labour Party. This despair is not of course a practical attitude; and the writers in question fail to realise how much the addition of every voice will help to realise the ultimate change. But it only shows the more clearly the urgent need of a common fight to bring in changes. The Labour Party is in its final basis built on the workers, through the trade unions; and through the trade unions, through the trade union branches and local labour parties, through the trade union district committees and higher organs, through the election of delegates, the fight for unity, for the class basis of the Labour Party, must be carried forward and is being carried forward. It is an essential part of this fight to endeavour to democratise the working of the Labour Party. If all the leading issues before a Conference were submitted to prior discussion by the workers in the unions, as well as in the relatively powerless local labour parties, with a resultant mandating of delegates, and with the referendum in the background, a very different type of Labour policy would rapidly follow. But the path to this lies through the conscious activity and co-operation of the united forces throughout the Labour Party.

R. P. D.

BOUND VOLUMES for 1935—Now Ready! In exchange for your 12 issues and 4/6 you can secure this invaluable commentary on the events of 1935—THE LABOUR MONTHLY—in permanent form, bound in handsome blue cloth and gilt lettering. WRITE IN AT ONCE—even if you have some issues missing. (Send 10/6 if you have no issues to exchange.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROBLEMS OF LABOUR POLICY

[At the beginning of this year in view of the many issues arising out of the General Election in relation to the future of Labour policy the LABOUR MONTHLY *decided to invite Labour M.P.s., Labour Candidates and others active in the Labour Movement to contribute their views with especial reference to last December Notes of the Month by R.P.D. entitled "After the Election," and the article by W. Rust, "The Future of the Labour Party" in the January issue. The following contributions are a further series of the replies to this invitation. It is hoped that these replies along with R.P.D.'s Notes of the Month on the previous pages of this issue will provide further material for all active members in the Labour Movement to participate in this Discussion and so lead to a further clarification of the vital issues raised.*

I.

By R. McKINNON WOOD

(*Late Labour Candidate for the Harborough Division of Leicestershire*).

THE growth of fascism and the drive and drift toward war should unite all progressive forces to co-operate in pursuit of peace and in defence of civil liberties. If the National Government be regarded as imperilling both peace and liberty—or either—there was much to be said for the strongest united front for the overthrow of the Government. What was the strongest union that could have been achieved for the election? The independent Liberals, with the Council of Action for Peace and Reconstruction, were electorally far more important that the C.P.G.B. and the I.L.P. But for co-operation with Liberals on the Right, the parties on the Left would have to be kept at arms length. Therefore the best hope for the defeat of the Government lay in an alliance with the Liberals alone.

The Liberal opposition to the National Government is insufficient to enable Liberals to swallow the nationalisation proposals of the Labour Party and the election would have to be fought on some such programme as that of the Council of Action: a more resolute pursuit of resistance to aggression; vigorous efforts to expand world trade; a bold programme of public works; extension of social services; some mild reorganisation

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the central bank and of certain depressed key industries. Some such programme might even have received the support of some Conservatives, and a National Government of the Left resulted, although I think it improbable.

In fact, the parties were guided by a more long-term view. Liberals have in part allied themselves with Tories, as the lesser of two evils, and in part hope to revive the fortunes of their party. Labour is intent on the path to Socialism it has mapped out and unwilling to step aside from it, while it desires to see the return to two-party politics in a clear issue on Socialism. It is also mindful of its experience of office dependent on Liberal support and mistrustful of achieving anything worth while through co-operation with Liberals. The Council of Action produced a manifesto that demanded radical change of policy that would clearly only result from change of government, but, with complete lack either of sincerity or of realism, neither sought to achieve a Liberal-Labour alliance nor throw its weight behind the Labour Party. These allies were in fact no good.

The principal feature of the election results of recent years has been the decline of the Liberal Party. The movement of Liberals takes place first, I think, to the Left and later to the Right, and it occurs earlier in the cities. The counties provide the remaining strongholds of Liberalism and the progress of Labour in the counties at the last election may be the working out of this principle. This coming off the fence rather acts against than for Labour representation in Parliament. In general, the result of the election tends to show that the electorate turns rather to the Right when war or economic crisis threatens.

It is desirable that an election be fought on a few clear issues between diametrically opposed policies. This election found public attention focussed on peace and international relations ; but especially on collective security, on which Labour could only indict the Government for its past weakness in pursuing a policy Labour would itself pursue, and question its present sincerity, while Sir Samuel Hoare had shown some awareness of the need for tackling root causes of war on principles of international co-operation. It is moreover difficult to bring home to the electorate the culpability of our own government in the collective failures of governments in the foreign sphere. The critical Labour Party conference was allowed to be dominated by the issue raised by the pacifist minority, giving an undue emphasis to divisions in the ranks, which was heightened in appearance by the resignation of the leader.

Labour has perhaps spent too much time saying "ditto, ditto" to the League of Nations Union and too little in developing and expounding an anti-imperialist policy, as the basis for peace and disarmament, on which a clear conflict might result. But whatever shortcomings there

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may have been in this direction, it is at least doubtful if Labour could have put up a much more vote-attracting fight in this sphere. Labour has acquired much support because it is regarded as the party of whole-hearted and realistic peace policy, but its strong appeal has been in home affairs, in the welfare of the people whose votes it seeks. From this aspect of politics, the international questions were distractions, while the synchronisms of history were unfortunate counter-arguments to the unsophisticated. The years of Labour Government had produced crisis : those of National Government recovery. And had not the Party's new leader said—as National propagandists were not slow to point out—that when Labour got power, crisis would at once arise. The British worker is generally not so dissatisfied that he will face risks, or wish to go through straitened times, for the sake of a brighter future. He is far from revolutionary and most likely to be uppish when he feels safest. Failing the catastrophe that will give the opportunity for some kind of violent revolution—I feel no certainty as to what kind—Britain seems most likely to advance to socialism during peace and prosperity.

I believe that under a Labour majority in Parliament crises of a kind will arise, earlier or later, and will need to be resolutely faced ; but that a Labour Government will, by tempering valour with discretion, be able to surmount them, bringing socialisation step by step without causing any suffering to the people, but rather with a steadily expanding prosperity. No doubt Mr. Attlee meant the same. If I am right, Communists have no place in the same political organisation, and would be a source of weakness to it : if I am wrong, they should lead the whole working-class movement. But wherever we see eye to eye, let us co-operate, whatever our general political philosophy may be.

To win the next election we need a new conception of party life and activity. We should be busy making socialists all the time, and I see the best prospect in the multitude of personal contacts of a large live membership, which must first educate itself and develop enthusiasm and loyalty through frequent regular meetings. Only on the foundation of a fairly large and very live membership can the party break through the apathy and prejudices that prevent the proletariat from achieving that solidarity that is at once the pre-requisite of effective Parliamentary power and the best guarantee of resolute socialist leadership.

II.

By T. D. SMITH

(*Member of First Executive Council, National Council of Labour Colleges*).

READING through the contributions to "Problems of Labour Policy" it is interesting to note the insistence on education. The necessity for an independent education of the workers has always been recognised, but judging from the events of the past twelve

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years practically nothing has been done. Labour candidates naturally realise the lack of any co-ordination when they enter a constituency, but the amazing thing is that having lost and left the district nothing more is done and the political enthusiasm having subsided there is the same old round of failure. One might wonder whether the Labour Party ever expect to win. Even in constituencies that have been or are represented by Labour, little is done apart from mild W.E.A. classes.

The potentialities of the Trade Union Movement have never been exploited apart from ill-fated ventures like the London Labour College which was fated to breed " officials " and never educationalists. Apart from the routine business of the collection of " subs " and occasional wage disputes, plus pious articles in some of the Trade journals, the Trade Union movement has produced nothing in the way of an educated democracy. Men blessed with a little knowledge rise to the position of officials, but any move for the general education of the rank and file has yet to see the light of day.

For some ten years I continuously lectured to classes, dealing with a variety of subjects from the Marxian point of view, and it certainly appeared when the old S.L.P., Plebs and other independent classes were welded together under the title of the National Council of Labour Colleges that a big step forward had been made. This is not the time to enquire into the reasons for the failure of this organisation to live up to our early hopes, but it certainly appears the time is ripe for another move to put Education in the front of the workers' programme.

An educational class offers the only means of bringing together in a locality workers from otherwise independent organisations. The contact of the members in a class is an education in itself, and from practical experience the fighters on all fronts have received both their theoretical and practical experience of the struggle in classes of this kind.

Education through the post is an easy method of evading the responsibility of teaching men and women orally. It is a cheap Yankee method which has nothing to recommend it and is the hall-mark of the educational shark, as reference to the columns of any paper will prove. One can only be surprised that so-called sensible people can be fobbed off with this shoddy substitute for the real thing.

Whilst the ordinary rank and file may be excused for not appreciating the value we place on education, why, may it be asked, have the Marxians who should be the first to realise its value, allowed the educational movement to sink to this sorry pass ?

It is safe to say, looking back over the last twelve years, that the movement was stronger and far more virile then than now. True, all sections of the working class have suffered over this period, but whilst the industrial

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and political movements have been subject to continued attack at least the educational side has had the field to itself.

Towns in which at one time there was a virulent educational movement have been dormant for years. Neither an independent educational movement, trades council, labour party or anyone else has been sufficiently interested to begin with the most important thing of all. It is a question whether our success (?) years ago was not the cause of our undoing, in that we created a national body at the expense of the strong, independent local associations.

If we are reasoning beings the mere presentation of the problem should be an incentive to the resurrection of our Marxian educational movement and from practical experience over a number of years it is reasonable to forecast that failing this being done we shall wait in vain for any healthy trade union or Labour Party revival, and we shall leave the workers at the mercy of those whose idea is the " Corporate " or Fascist state.

III.

By JOHN MORRIS

(*General Secretary, University Labour Federation*).

LAST January the Annual Conference of the University Labour Federation (U.L.F.) ratified the unification of the two socialist student organisations, itself, and the Federation of Student Societies, a body, which, while not specifically communist, was nevertheless under communist domination. (Similar developments have taken place in other countries ; the Student Socialist International, a body which till 1934 followed the old traditions of German Social-Democracy, pronounced itself in favour of United Front activities at its conference of that year. Since that date, amalgamation has also taken place in Belgium and in the United States, and the question of the unity of all revolutionary students will be raised very sharply at the coming congress in Oxford this summer.)

The specific reasons which have enabled the students to advance rather faster than other sections of the Labour Movement along the general path need not detain us here. It is enough to say that the conference took this decision unanimously on the basis of our experiences over the past few years.

I welcome the inclusion of the Communist Party in the Labour Party as an access of strength, not so much in quantity as in quality. I have found that the Communists are capable of making a very clear and very powerful appeal to the middle classes, and it is precisely among these classes that our work lies. Their importance hardly needs emphasising ; again it is not a question so much of winning a number of individuals receiving higher wages than the average, but of winning the very large sections of workers and small bourgeoisie who are still under the influence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of middle class ideas. The trouble we were continually running up against during the election, expressed somewhat crudely, was the answer to the accusation made by the capitalists—" You socialists cannot run our system efficiently." We felt the official reply—" Yes, we can ; look at the L.P.T.B. and the L.C.C. "—to be unconvincing and unsatisfactory. We found much greater response to the answer—" We don't intend to run your system for you ; we want to get rid of it as soon as we can, and put in its place a system that will bring an end to the poverty, the crimes, and the wars of capitalism."

Still more important, we have suffered considerably from the inability of the Labour Party and the T.U.C. to organise the mass of anti-fascist and peace-loving opinion outside the ranks of their own members and immediate supporters, their inability to give a real lead to the Peace Balloters. We found, in most of the major universities, that the Liberals and the League of Nations Union, after they had overcome their initial reluctance, were far more willing to negotiate with the communist students than with us.

I think these experiences have taught us that the important question at the moment is not the doctrine or brand of socialist theory, where endless differences remain ; but the question of mobilising public opinion against war and against the National Government, and of making recruits to any sort of socialism ; and we have found that the communist students have a very valuable contribution to make to this task.

Our principal difficulty, which is, I think, the principle barrier to unity now in the Labour Movement, is the memory of the past mistakes, personal and political, committed by the communists individually and collectively. It is very largely because our experience is shorter that we have been able to leave them behind so quickly, and to welcome the Seventh Congress of the Comintern as something new and of far-reaching importance ; and I am confident, that though it will be a long and a hard struggle, these prejudices will be broken down throughout the Labour Movement, so that unity may be made possible.

IV.

By LEONARD WELLS.

THE plea for the union of the Labour Party and the Communist Party coming chiefly from the latter party, the views expressed on the subject are usually from the communist perspective. I am a supporter of the Labour Party and am convinced that much can be said in favour of the United Front from a more definitely Labour Party angle.

Although I favour the union of the two parties I am not a communist. It is patent to me that it would be far more desirable to establish socialism, you can call it communism if you like for fundamentally they are the same,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by democratic than by revolutionary means. If the great privation and suffering which would inevitably be occasioned by drastic social and economic changes can possibly be avoided even if it means waiting a little longer for socialism, I am prepared to wait. Even the most impatient of us must appreciate that a successful socialist revolution implies not the immediate establishment of socialism but the beginning of a social phase in which socialism may be established.

On the other hand, I do not wish for the dissolution of the Communist Party for, even in this country, Fascism, and by that I do not mean merely fascist tendencies which are already present, is a contingent if not an imminent possibility and only a party with the organisation, discipline and training of the Communist Party could possibly survive.

In desiring the co-operation of the two parties, therefore, I cannot agree with my friends who urge that if communists sincerely desire to assist the Labour Party they should resign from their organisation and become members of the Labour Party. That point of view is indicative of a lack of understanding of modern economic and social trends.

From the theoretical point of view the Communist Party is the more advanced, but the Labour Party is the party of the masses and is more in harmony with the idiosyncrasies and traditions of the British working classes. A marriage of these parties would, I am confident, definitely tend to promote the establishment of socialism in this country.

The anti-communist prejudice in the Labour Party, especially among the senior membership, is due in a large measure to the stupid and tactless attacks which communists have made on the Labour Party, some indeed even going so far as to suggest that the Labour Party is consciously leading the workers towards fascism, and by foolish attempts made by communists in the past to break up the Labour Party. This prejudice is difficult to counteract and can be overcome only by the exercising of great tact by communists. I have no doubt that the Communist Party appreciates its past mistakes and now takes a more propitious view of my party.

In the Labour Party there is, too, a belief that the Communist Party desires unity in order that it may gain control of the Labour Party and, further, in order that the membership of the Labour Party will thereby be rendered more favourably disposed towards the Communist Party and an increase in the membership of that party will ensue. In advancing such arguments against the United Front those members are unwittingly paying a great tribute to the Communist Party, for they are saying, in effect, that the Communist Party is a more advanced political force. This tribute is often rendered greater by those members declaring, almost in the same breath, that the Communist Party is too small a party for the consideration of the powerful Labour Party. In order to combat these fears and prejudices it must be pointed out that had those members a real

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

faith in their own movement and in the integrity and capacity of their leaders they would appreciate that the consequences of the United Front might be quite the opposite, and that the United Front would tend to remove the anti-Labour Party bias of so many communists who, as a result of co-operation with the Labour Party, would learn that the mass membership of that party is genuinely desirous of substituting socialism for the present chaos called capitalism. The effect of unity might well be, then, not the control of the Labour Party by the Communist Party, but the liquidation of the latter party and the removal of a thorn in the side of the Labour Party. Personally, I do not desire that to happen ; it would be better that the Communist Party retains its autonomy in order that the Labour Party might have the advantage of well-informed criticism and not merely biased attacks from the left.

Another reason adduced for opposing the United Front is that it would cause the Labour Party to lose votes. That arises from a mistaken view of the rôle of the middle classes held by a right-wing section of the Labour Party which favours the scrapping of socialism from our policy and the substitution of a programme of mild social reform to catch the votes of those uncertain electoral elements. It is obviously important to win over those middle classes, but that must not be done at the expense of losing the support of the working classes. I am not aware exactly what further modifications the right-wing proposes. The last General Election was fought on a programme which was other than a bold socialist one and an analysis of the voting reveals that the Labour Party lost ground in some very important towns and industrial areas, especially in the north. This point of view fails to take account of, or underestimates, the ingenuity and experience of the Tories who are always able to defeat the Labour Party at appealing to the " respectable elements " from that aspect.

I believe that the Labour Party will never gain effective Parliamentary control except as the result of an appeal to the electorate on a bold and concise socialist programme ; a decisive and determined stand will rally both the workers and the nervous middle classes. That is my primary reason for supporting the United Front which I hope will ensure that the Labour Party returns to the more militant course of its early pioneers.

I do not seek to minimise the undoubted difficulties which will have to be overcome if the United Front is to be realised, but if both parties are prepared to take a reasonable attitude there are many points upon which there can be complete unity, and socialists will then be able to look to the future with optimism.

[*Previous contributions by David Freeman, R. F. St. J. Reade, E. Shearer, Professor G. E. G. Catlin, Professor Harold J. Laski, John Lewis, W. H. Bennett and the Editor of the " Rotherhithe Labour News," were published in the February and March issues (7d. each, post free, from 7 John St., W.C. 1.)*]

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ON THE KNIFE EDGE

By AITKEN FERGUSON

IT is to-day necessary not only to stress the gravity of the war danger but to thrash out a line—a policy, which can postpone and avert that war danger.

The rush of recent events, like the Arms Commission revelations, the White Paper, the debate in Parliament on Defence, the proposed British re-armament regardless of cost, the flood of jingo propaganda which is now beginning to pour out—all these have shocked and alarmed friends of peace everywhere. When to them is added the frenzied re-armament in Germany (£1,500 millions in three years, according to Churchill) and now the latest provocative occupation and re-militarisation of the Rhineland by Hitler Germany, then it becomes clear that the world is literally trembling on a very knife-edge of Peace or War.

If we are going to understand the forces which have brought humanity to this pass, if we are going to pursue a correct path to ward off war, then certain things will require to be borne in mind. First, that capitalist countries are not united entities, but countries with varying and sometimes conflicting bourgeois groups, and in addition rent and torn with class struggle. Secondly, that these capitalist countries are ruled in accordance with the policies of the dominant capitalist class, and not according to the personal idiosyncracies of this or that dictator. The Hitler policy like the Mussolini policy, is the policy of German and Italian finance capital, and is approved by them.

The Origins of the Present War Crisis

The present war crisis flows from the world economic crisis, and is its outcome. In the intensified economic war which came with the crisis, a war waged by tariffs, quotas, subsidies, with depreciated currencies and colossal Government Exchange equalisation funds to manipulate the money exchanges, the fascist states were worsted. They had no Empire to "cushion the shock" of the economic crisis, no gigantic reserves to tide them over. As a result, defeat and deeper poverty in these countries. Cracks and rifts began to appear in their capitalist structure and enormous revolutionary tension began to accumulate underneath the surface.

The fascist states began to raise the slogans of war. They claimed that they were hemmed in, that they required territories, markets, colonies, a place in the sun, they must "expand," national honour must be satisfied.

The war slogans were only aggravated, the fascist political war propaganda was helped when the Baldwin Government, through Hoare and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other spokesmen, began to sympathise with and support these fascist claims. Hoare last July said in the Commons :

> I should like also to make it clear that we have always understood and will understand Italy's desire for expansion. Indeed we have in the past done our best to show our sympathy with Italian aspirations in a practical way . . . We admit the need for Italian expansion. (*Times*, July 12th, 1935).

Hitler Germany taking courage from this attitude and from the more direct help afforded by the Baldwin Government with its arms, finance, and sustained diplomatic support, has now by its Rhineland occupation blown the smouldering embers into a war flame.

What is the Socialist Attitude

Now we hear on all sides the ominous phrase ; " it is 1914 over again." Let us right at the outset nail down some principles, which in the welter of developing tactical lines to meet particular tactical questions, are in danger of being obscured.

The Socialist position on war is clear and straightforward opposition to our own capitalist Government, opposition to their war plans, to their war credits, to their armaments, " root and branch " opposition, whole-hearted and sustained. That is the hub, the centre, the essential of any fight to save peace and save the Socialist movement. If, despite the barriers that we do put in the way of war, it does actually break out, then we work to weaken, to defeat and overthrow our own Government.

But the realisation of this fundamental Socialist strategy is to be seen not in a simple, straightforward fashion, but through many, many channels, through all the complex groups of questions which are arising and which must be faced. We are not like the Generals in the last war who only discovered just at the end of the war the way to accomplish a big advance was not by a massed straight line advance, but by " filtration " methods.

Similarly, if Socialists expect that the problem of war to-day is simply identical with that of 1914, when all the imperialist powers were engaged in a looting and piratical war, then they are sadly and tragically mistaken.

No crude analogy with 1914 will serve to-day. What are the differences ?

To-day and 1914—*The Difference.*

In 1914 Germany was out to grab French colonies and France was out to grab Alsace Lorraine. Russia was out to grab Constantinople and to make the Balkans a Russian sphere of influence. Britain was out to smash the German trade menace and the naval menace. Austria was out to smash Serbia. Surely these are very substantial differences compared with the situation now.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1914 there was encirclement of Germany in order to attack and despoil Germany. To-day those who hold that there is once again encirclement, who maintain that the Franco-Soviet and the Czecho-Slovakian-Soviet Pacts mean encirclement must show the world that they are for attacking or despoiling Germany. The very statement shows how utterly nonsensical such an idea is.

To-day, what is the main difference with 1914. First a group of fascist states are openly proclaiming the necessity of a new division of the world, and their intention of achieving world domination through their war capacity and strength. Note in this connection that Hitler refuses to withdraw the war aims of *Mein Kampf*, even in connection with France.

In opposition to this Fascist War group of powers, headed by Germany, there stands another group, composed of France and the smaller powers of the Little Entente. There is no necessity to idealise these powers or to conceal the fact that they are frankly out for their own interests, which at the moment coincide with the maintenance of Peace. These states are torn with many antagonisms, and will only act for the cause of Peace provided that they are pushed by their own peoples, and as we now can see in response to the enormous strength and pressure of the Soviet Union in the cause of peace.

It should be noted as well that Italy, which formally is lined up in the group of powers standing against German Fascism's war is pursuing a policy of war and colonial expansion which aids German Fascism.

Then there is British Imperialism. It is clear that British Imperialism is at the very centre of the war web that is being spun in Europe, and Asia. As in 1914 it stood with "Vizor Down," deceiving the Germans, Russians, and even the French as to its real intentions, so to-day its Vizor is again down.

It is clear that one of the reproaches, directed even by Liberals and Pacifists against Grey of Falloden and the Asquith Government, is that had the real intentions of the British been known in 1914, then it might have given Germany and Austria a sobering shock in their war lust at that particular time. It is to-day clear that this reproach is justified up to the hilt.

The "City" wanted war in 1914, and its method was the classical method of concealing its real intentions beneath a screen of "pacifist" "fair seeming" "pro-democratic" and "neutrality" phrases. The same tactic to-day. The vizor is down, the web is being spun, the old lying catchwords "for Peace," "negotiate"—"fair to both sides," are being dragged out. And lo, snared right in the centre of the web, are the Liberals, the Pacifists—even the *News Chronicle* and the *Daily Herald.*

True, there are differences to-day, important differences.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

First there is the deep rooted belief that Fascist Germany must expand, indeed must be helped to expand—only, no expansion in the British Empire zone. Secondly, there is the fact that the British ruling class have the deepest, the most bitter, and burning hatred (greater than any other capitalist power) of the Soviet Union. That is the reason for the years of help to Japan in the hope that she would drive against the Soviet Union. That is why Britain has striven consistently for the building up of a powerful Germany which would strike a blow at Britain's enemy, the Soviet Union.

That is why there is the theory of closing the West to Germany while the East is left open as a safety valve, as the line of the Baldwins, the Mosleys, the Londonderrys, etc. There are, however, very important elements in Britain who are prepared to go even further in their fanatical hatred of the Soviet Union.

Elements who are prepared to sacrifice the British Empire itself, if only Soviet Russia can be wounded to the death. Elements for whom the general interests of capitalism override even such particular interests as the existence of this British Empire, and these general interests are conceived as being the destruction of the U.S.S.R.

British Policy is Pro-Nazi Policy.

Consequently the National Government has pursued a consistent pro-Nazi policy. This is the significance of the Stresa Front, of the "Naval Agreement," of the support for German conscription and of the well-known Glasgow sneer of Baldwin at collective security.

This is why, when after the French Government had been forced by public opinion to give a categorical affirmative to Britain's demand for support in the event of an Italian attack on the British fleet they were fobbed off when they in their turn demanded a categorical statement of Britain's attitude in the event of a German breach of Treaty.

The British Government delivered a typical, indeed a classical, reply consisting of qualifications and evasions. "Elasticity," they said, "is a part of agreements"; "the world is not static"; "there may be degrees of agression"; "the nature of the action may vary according to the circumstances of each case."

These phrases, this whole reply was nothing more nor less than the "green light" for Hitler, the public "all clear" to go into the Rhineland so far as Britain was concerned.

Let every friend of Peace in reflecting on this, bear also in mind that the failure decisively to check Mussolini, the half-hearted to and fro attitude of the British Government in respect of the Abyssinian war, the failure to impose oil sanctions—all these had their effect in encouraging

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hitler. This National Government is not and never was the friend but the enemy of collective security and the League of Nations.

The Rhineland occupation is a War act. Consider ; only a year ago Hitler solemnly swore to uphold Locarno. Only a fortnight before the troops marched Hitler gives an interview to a French journalist, Jouvenal, in which he draws attention to how Germany is carrying through her desire for Peace, *i.e.*, by leaving the Rhineland zone demilitarised.

Now the guns are once more pointing at the heart of France.

Hitler, however, well understands the technique of minimising War actions by Peace gestures. When Germany left the League of Nations a spate of Peace gestures. When Germany introduced conscription a spate of Peace gestures. When Germany got the Saar, Peace gestures again and the declaration by Hitler, that, " all things are now settled between France and Germany." Now, the open flagrant tearing up of the Locarno Treaty.

This latest act has roused Europe. Nations now understand that this means War, that it represents the formal raising of the War curtain ; that if Hitler Germany gets off with this to-day, it will be somewhere else that the blow will fall to-morrow. The most terrible feature of the situation is not the fact that the Baldwin Government is shielding and helping Hitler, but that British pacifist elements, as represented by the *News Chronicle* and the *Daily Herald*, are also taken in.

Not only so, but they have gone even beyond the National Government in advocating concessions. " Use the League of Nations only when British capitalist interests are involved " seems to be the line of the two papers who only a few short weeks ago were howling about the necessity of treaty breakers such as Mussolini being dealt with.

Are we to believe that these papers are so simple as to be taken in by a flood of specious Peace Declarations, and fail to understand the significance of the War act these declarations cover ? Cannot they see that their action in demanding concessions for Hitler has disheartened the Peace forces in this and other countries and encouraged the War forces ? Cannot they grasp the significance of the fact that this Nazi Government, this Government of Trade Union Murderers, of Jew Baiters, of Culture Haters ; this Government which " Spits upon Democracy "—this is the Government which is broadcasting the editorials and messages from the *News Chronicle* and *Daily Herald* ? These editorials thus become a weapon for Hitler and Goebbels and Goering. Surely to be held up as a shield for Herr Streicher is the last straw ?

Yet even Hitler cannot hide his war aims. He pours out venom upon the Soviet Union even while he talks of Peace. He makes no mention of Austria and Czecho-Slovakia, when he first burst out with his proposed Pacts.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He makes no secret of the fact that a big gap has been opened in the Peace Front, a gap created by the double faced policy of the National Government, and by its virtual defection from the League.

Yet there is one advantage. The situation is clearer and sharper to-day. The battleground of all these who love Peace and hate Fascism is becoming sharply, very sharply, defined. Peace if it is to be won can only be won by forcing the British Government to line up in a Peace Front of the Nations against the Nazi aggressor.

Nazism Menaces more than the Soviet Union

The question of the Nazi menace to the U.S.S.R. is undoubtedly acute. The defence of the U.S.S.R. by every means and at any cost remains a fundamental principle of the international working-class movement and one from which they will not shrink.

But the illusion that it is only the U.S.S.R. which is menaced by the Fascist threats must be exposed. The Soviet Union is strong and powerful to-day. Strong enough probably to turn the edge of the Japanese attack, strong enough adequately to defend itself against any capitalist power in the whole world. The guns of Fascist Germany are pointing to the heart of France, the air forts of Fascist Germany point north-west and west as well as East. Litvinov, in his speech at the Locarno Conference, said very, very significantly :

> His aggression may in fact aim at other countries in the immediate future. His attacks in the Soviet Union may so far serve merely as a smoke screen for aggression which is being prepared against other countries.

Note this very well all you haters of war. Note it well, you pacifists of the *News Chronicle* and *Daily Herald.* It is not only a question of saving the U.S.S.R. It is becoming a question of saving ourselves. Every month that passes the U.S.S.R. will become mightier and mightier, yet it will fight just as ardently and effectively to save the world for Peace —even though it be not menaced directly itself, even though its enormous power and enormous resources be such as to deter Hitler Germany from a war encounter.

How to Fight for Peace.

One cannot fight successfully against war mongers in general. Our fight to avert war must be against our own Government, in whose hands rest the keys of Peace or War.

What do we ask the Government to do ? To abandon pro-Hitlerism, and to stand by the Franco-Soviet Pact. Is this Pact anything but a Peace Pact ? To-day everyone recognises that it is. Does it mean encirclement of Germany ? How can it when Germany was invited,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nay pressed, to join ? Is it not rather an encirclement of war, a gathering of Powers sufficiently strong to make even the most audacious war makers pause ?

Further, if the re-occupation of the Rhineland is a war act, then the Government should take its stand on the necessity of withdrawing the troops and have no negotiations until that is done. If the principle of accepting a *fait accompli* is followed, then the world is being steered and deliberately steered to war. If there is no troop withdrawal, then there should be no financial relations until the troops are withdrawn.

Does this mean unity with the National Government ? Does it mean that because we stand for a wall of collective security we are committed to support the arms programme of our Government ? By no means !

Surely it is obvious that to get even these first steps of collective security carried out, will involve the most unrelenting and bitter struggle against the National Government with its pro-Hitler policy. If the Socialist and Labour Movement in its desire for collective security ever lines up, tolerates, or co-operates with this Government then it would be disastrous.

The fight for peace in Britain involves the fight against the re-armament programme of the Government. It involves a fight for the overthrow of this Government and its replacement by a Labour Government.

The struggle for peace is only waged through all the complex issues which life brings to the fore ; it is waged by taking advantage of all the new possibilities which are opened up by the unevenness of capitalist development in the various countries ; it is waged by exploiting to the full the contradictions and varying interests of the imperialist powers.

This is the Marxist task to-day, and while doing so to use every occasion, every opportunity to deepen the socialist consciousness of the peace forces, and to work steadily through a thousand different channels for the overthrow of capitalism.

Above all, never to forget that it is upon the organised Labour Movement that the responsibility falls. Without a clear and unequivocal repudiation of any co-operation with this Government in its armaments plan, without a recognition of its international responsibilities, without a mass drive to lift up, to invigorate and enthuse the Peace Forces of Britain—without all these things success in the struggle for peace cannot be won. But with them we can fight a victorious fight and a breathing space for peace will have been secured.

Have you got your 1935 BOUND VOLUME ?
If not, see p. 205.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TOM MANN

By ALLEN HUTT

ON the fifteenth of this month Tom Mann reaches his 80th birthday. Engels from his personal knowledge of Tom spoke highly of him in his correspondence. As we tender Tom our affectionate and respectful—I had almost said filial—congratulations, it is natural that Engels' opinion should be uppermost in our minds. For the near fifty years that have since passed have demonstrated its accuracy. Alone among the remarkable band of leaders that our working-class movement threw up in those apocalyptic days of its historical rebirth Tom Mann, the noble veteran, remains the same as Tom Mann the young enthusiast. Then he was a consistent revolutionary socialist working man—and he is so still. Others have faltered, flung away their arms, deserted to the enemy. Tom, undaunted, has stuck to his post in the line of battle.

It is a great and honourable thing when a man adheres unshakably, throughout a long life, to the revolutionary principles he embraced in youth. It testifies to personal character and intellectual integrity of the highest order. To Tom Mann this applies in exceptional measure. Yet this fact alone would not be enough to give his present anniversary its peculiar significance. Something has to be added to it ; and that, in my view, is to be found in the way that Tom's life sums up in itself, personifies if you like, all that is most full of meaning in the history of a mighty class and its movement.

This is no time or place for the conventional tributes of biographical sketch or commemorative rhetoric. That will no doubt be done elsewhere. For those who do not know the exciting details of Tom's life story his own *Memoirs* are happily available ; and to attempt here what would inevitably be a bald précis of that vivid work would be entirely superfluous. My purpose is otherwise.

First obvious point is that Tom Mann is both a life-long revolutionary and an Englishman—an English working man. Here are his two fundamental attributes, inextricably intertwined the one with the other. Anyone who sought to abstract Tom the revolutionary from his national background would not have the real man. We younger English revolutionaries know to our cost of how many of us in the past (and some still) it would not be possible to say that. Let us remember Dimitrov's injunction that working-class internationalism needs to " acclimatise itself " in each country in order to sink deep roots in its native land ; then, if we wish for an example, it is only necessary to look at Tom Mann.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tom mirrors those qualities which are commonly extolled as typically English. He does so because in fact those qualities are typical, not of English society as a whole, but of one class in that society, the working class. Take our boasted English tenacity, the never-know-when-we-are beaten, boys of the bulldog breed stuff. Perfectly true—of the working class. Was this not the very thing that so struck Engels throughout half a century's field observation of social conflict in this country? It was in the 'forties, speaking of strikes, that he declared the English working men to be "second to none in courage," adding that "precisely in this quiet perseverance, in this lasting determination which undergoes a hundred tests every day, the English working man develops that side of his character which commands most respect. People who endure so much to bend one single bourgeois will be able to break the power of the whole bourgeoisie." In the 'nineties he remarked that "independent nations go their own way, and of them all the English and their offspring are surely the most independent. Their insular stiff-necked obstinacy annoys one often enough, but it also guarantees that once a thing gets started, what is begun will be carried out."

"Courage," "quiet perseverance," "lasting determination"—these qualities have been Tom's from the start. Young and old alike he has known the persecution that is the revolutionary leader's lot. To this he has ever shown the same bold front, exemplified in his sturdy conduct of his own defence in his historic trial at Manchester in 1912 for the "Don't shoot!" appeal. Early on in his socialist days he met repeated victimisation ("whilst we admit you are a decent young fellow," said one manager, "we don't keep this shop going to give you opportunities of preaching Socialism"), but did not hesitate to dispose of his "fairly good collection of books, a violin and a telescope" in order to procure the subsistence needed to keep on with his work of agitation and organisation.

In 1884 the engineering trade in London was very slack and Tom tramped round from shop to shop in vain. At last he managed to get a start on the construction of Tilbury Docks; but, he recounts,

> My home was in Chiswick, eight miles west of Charing Cross, whilst Tilbury Docks are twenty-two miles east. It was not merely that there was a distance of thirty miles between home and work, but in order to reach Tilbury from Chiswick in the early morning the following was the method. To get the first workman's train from Hammersmith, it was necessary to walk the two miles from Chiswick to Hammersmith, then on the Metropolitan to Aldgate, then walk to Fenchurch Street to get the Tilbury train to start a day's work with the rest. The present town of Grays was at that time no more than a few streets to meet the needs of the men engaged on the Docks, and I lodged there getting home at week-ends; but also, on the night of the meeting of our lecture society at Chiswick, I used to ask for an hour off, and so leave at four o'clock and get to Chiswick to participate in the meeting and then enjoy the morning journey as already described.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Even when he was able to get work in Lambeth and removed to Battersea to be near at hand, it has to be remembered that in those days factories started at 6 a.m. "Every week-end," Tom tells us, "I was busy on propaganda work, usually speaking three times on the Sunday—twice in the open-air and once indoors," the round of meetings covering all points of London, "rarely reaching home before 11 p.m., to be up at 5 o'clock next morning."

The toughness of character so vividly illustrated in these quotations, the tenacity that showed itself not in mere obstinate stonewalling but in the positive output of tireless energy, is an essential quality of the class in which alone "reposes the strength and the capacity of development of the [English] nation" (Engels). Its other expression, the sense that "what is begun will be carried out," was also from the first outstanding in Tom Mann's life and work. Tom was a highly skilled workman, able to hold his own with his craft-conscious and craft-proud fellows. Good workmanship in the shop was paralleled by good workmanship in the movement. Whether a job is turning a piece of metal on a lathe or enlightening and organising masses of men it can be done well or badly, it can be a good job or a botch. To the wider social task Tom has always brought the punctuality and precision, the sense of responsibility and initiative, that he learnt within the four walls of the factory. Every one of the infinite number of things he has done for the movement during more than half a century has been a good job. Whether it has been an organising campaign, a propaganda tour, a single speech, an article or pamphlet, Tom has always carried out to the letter the obligations he has assumed.

All that has been said above might very well be put shortly in this way—Tom has always and in every sense been a man of the masses, a true son of the common working people of England. Here is no pure-milk-of-the-word sectarian, looking loftily down at poor ignorant folk. Here is no shallow opportunist seeking to cover his lack of faith in his own class and his superstitious awe of the governing class by blaming everything on the workers and their supposed "apathy." Tom Mann has never lacked the respect and affection of his fellow workers, because he was one of themselves. There is an all-round, wide humanity about Tom as there always is about the best fighters of the working class. Full of the lively wit, the unfailing good humour, the joviality and good companionship, the high spirits, the simplicity and frankness which are the attributes of any normal body of English working men, Tom is the eternal refutation of the Philistine caricature of a revolutionary.

Whether in speech or writing Tom Mann has always been simple, direct and homely, here again showing how unshakably his whole being is rooted in the masses. The Warwickshire lad who had no schooling worth the name, who was at work at nine years of age and slaving down the pit

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at ten, who later had to fight for his education and culture in the alien surroundings of Sunday School, Church gathering and adult class, proved one of the greatest and most persuasive orators the working class of this country has ever known. Charles A. Glyde, Tom's lieutenant during his Lancashire sojourn in 1888-89, relates how "he was one of the best speakers I have known . . . with the first word uttered he gripped his audience and kept them spell-bound until the end. He had a thorough command of language, and he sent forth his arguments in rasp-like incisive sentences which greatly impressed his auditors and carried conviction to their minds." Of Tom's style, so easily understanded of the people, the following random instance (it dates from 1890) must suffice:

> We have abundance of raw material from Mother Earth, and the capacity of our workers is increasing each year, so that from the raw material we can with a less expenditure of energy create a greater number of commodities for the energy expended. That being so, we argue that there is no divinely ordained reason, no natural reason, why any man, woman or child need be short of food or clothing, or the necessities of human existence; and we therefore contend that, as soon as the present chaos gives place to industrial order, there will be a chance for all to live proper lives: and that is the work of us trade unionists at the present time—so to organise ourselves, and to get the workers generally so effectively organised, that we can insist on the necessary changes taking place.

Tom, indeed, can rightly claim to be, as Glyde calls him, a "great tribune of the workers." This rings out in the peroration of his address to the electors of North Aberdeen, forty years ago this month—"I am prepared for any kind of opposition. Fearing no one's power, courting no one's favour, I state my case as a workman who, if returned, would have some satisfaction in trying to fight on the floor of the House of Commons as I have endeavoured to fight outside." Does not that sound of one piece with Lenin's famous advice to the Bolshevik deputies in the Duma on how revolutionaries should act in Parliament?

Keen realism, an ever-present sense of the practical, was also a marked quality of Tom's from the first. Here was an agitator who was also an organiser and a man of affairs. Within two years of leading the great Dock strike, for instance, he had submitted to the Royal Commission on Labour (of which he was a member), an original and fully elaborated scheme for consolidating the whole dock services of the Port of London. He set forth a plan for tackling the mass of anarchic, competing vested interests, unifying the port authority, cheapening charges and making the docks fully efficient by erecting new docks and warehouses, and cutting a new channel for the Thames across the Isle of Dogs. This was a first-class constructive scheme, aiming also at decasualising dock labour, which showed the revolutionary strike leader to be far better acquainted with the problems of the dock service in London than the dockowners themselves.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tom's constant realism manifested itself another way—in his appreciation of the importance of immediate demands. Long hours in youth had left their mark, and he was a peculiarly keen and able advocate for a shorter working day enforced by law. The compulsory eight-hour day was the subject of his first pamphlet. On this issue, which proved itself a most potent lever for the raising of a great mass movement, Tom came into vehement conflict with the dogmatic sectarians of the Social Democratic Federation. He has himself recounted how at a meeting of the Battersea branch in 1886, when he urged that the Federation should take this issue seriously, he was attacked by John Burns and John Ward ; the one declared that " the time had passed for such trivial reforms . . . . the capitalist system was on its last legs " while the other " was ready to take action for a physical force overthrow, and certainly was not prepared to spend time over anything so paltry as an eight-hour day." The subsequent history of Tom's two antagonists provides sufficient comment.

On another vital issue, that of the trade unions and their significance, Tom stood out virtually alone against the dominant S.D.F. sectarianism. Since the end of his apprenticeship Tom Mann had been an active member of his union, the Amalgamated Society of Engineers (now the A.E.U.). While yielding to no man in the vigour of his criticism of the shortcomings of the trade unions of that day, and of the A.S.E. in particular, he realised that the trade unionists must be the backbone of a revolutionary socialist working men's party in this country. From the beginning the line of Hyndman and his associates in the S.D.F. leadership had been a root-and-branch denunciation of trade unionism. " Herein," Tom rightly says, " Hyndman was essentially bourgeois and lacked perspicacity in that he failed to see the probable development of affairs." This policy " antagonised trade unionists without drawing over any considerable percentage to the socialist position," while an opposite policy would have cleared the way for the transformation of the S.D.F. into an influential mass party.

When the epoch of " New Unionism " opened it took the S.D.F. leaders by surprise. Here was a revolutionary transformation of the trade union movement, hailed by Engels as " the greatest and most fruitful fact of this *fin de siècle*," of which Tom Mann was one of the principal architects. Yet the Hyndmanites met it and its leaders with salvoes of abuse because they would not " unfurl the Red Flag " immediately. The consequent divorce between the New Unionists and the revolutionary Socialists marked a historical turning point. The way was clear for the growth of reformism. " With the defection of the New Unionists," say the Webbs, " revolutionary Socialism ceased to grow ; and the rival propaganda of constitutional action became the characteristic feature of the British Socialist Movement." The sectarianism against which Tom Mann had so justly fought bears the main

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

responsibility for what Lenin was later to call the " deplorable example " offered by Britain " of how the isolation of the Labour Movement from Socialism inevitably leads to degeneration and bourgeois ideas."

Much more might be said about the life-long activity of our great veteran. His journeyings through the world, from China to the United States, from Scandinavia to the Antipodes, carrying revolutionary Socialism's message, organising trade unions, leading strikes, are a symbol of the internationalism which has always burned strongly in him.

Here it is appropriate to conclude with the thought already indicated. Tom Mann's heroic life of battle for his class has been an unremitting effort to *combine* revolutionary Socialism with the mass Labour Movement ; and that is the essence of Lenin's teaching, the essence of Bolshevism, the reason why Socialism is triumphant among 160,000,000 of the human race. With Engels, Tom has seen " how useless a platform is—theoretically correct to a large extent—if it does not show understanding of how to fasten on to the real needs of the people." But this implies one further vital thing, the establishment of a Party uniting clear and sharp revolutionary theory with the practical capacity to organise and lead the decisive mass of the workers. That, too, Tom saw. When the S.D.F. failed him he turned to the I.L.P., but was again disappointed. The absence of such a Party was the principal cause, I believe, of his deflection into Syndicalism and his years as the " stormy petrel " of the Labour Movement, an independent partisan warrior rather than the leader of an army. The Russian Revolution and the foundation of the Communist International changed all that. Tom found his Party at last, gaining new strength from the association.

Tom Mann's 80th birthday is no mere personal affair. It is a celebration for the millions-strong working-class movement of this country. Honouring a figure who stands out, sturdy and unconquerable, already part of the very stuff of history, we turn our hands to his work. Unity, solidarity before all, is and has always been the breath of Tom's being. At a moment when it was never more urgent a need, let his powerful example inspire us to achieve it—and then on to storm the heights.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EASTER WEEK, 1916

By PAT DEVINE

ON Easter Monday, 24th April, 1916 (twenty years ago), in the midst of the "last" Imperialist War, the world was shocked by the news that, after 700 years of oppression, the people of Ireland, led by a heroic band of Socialist and Republican men and women, had declared a Sovereign Independent Irish State.

The declaration read as follows:

POBLACHT NA H EIREANN
THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT
OF THE
IRISH REPUBLIC.
To the People of Ireland.

"*Irishmen and Irishwomen.* In the name of God and of the dead generations from which she receives her old tradition of nationhood, Ireland, through us, summons her children to her flag and strikes for her freedom.

"Having organised and trained her manhood through her secret revolutionary organisation, the Irish Republican Brotherhood, and through her open military organisations, the Irish Volunteers and the Irish Citizen Army, having patiently perfected her discipline, having resolutely waited for the right moment to reveal itself, she now seizes that moment, and, supported by her exiled children in America and by gallant allies in Europe, but relying on the first on her own strength, she strikes in full confidence of victory.

"We declare the right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland, and to the unfettered control of Irish destinies, to be sovereign and indefeasible. The long usurpation of that right by a foreign people and government has not extinguished the right, nor can it ever be extinguished except by the destruction of the Irish people. In every generation the Irish people have asserted their right to national freedom and sovereignty; six times during the past three hundred years they have asserted it in arms. Standing on that fundamental right and again asserting it in arms in the face of the world, we hereby proclaim the Irish Republic as a Sovereign Independent State, and we pledge our lives and the lives of our comrades in arms to the cause of its freedom, of its welfare, and of its exhaltation among the nations.

"The Irish Republic is entitled to and hereby claims the allegiance of every Irishman and Irishwoman. The Republic guarantees religious and civil liberty, equal rights and equal opportunities to all citizens, and declares its resolve to pursue the happiness and prosperity of the whole nation and of all its parts, cherishing all the children of the nation equally, and oblivious of the differences carefully fostered by an alien government, which have divided a minority from the majority in the past.

"Until our arms have brought the opportune moment for the establishment of a permanent National Government, representative of the whole people of Ireland and elected by the suffrages of all her men and women, the Provisional

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Government hereby constituted, will administer the civil and military affairs of the Republic in trust for the people.

" We place the cause of the Irish Republic under the protection of the Most High God, whose blessing we invoke upon our arms, and we pray that no one who serves that cause will dishonour it by cowardice, inhumanity or rapine. In this supreme hour the Irish nation must, by its valour and discipline and by the readiness of its children to sacrifice themselves for the common good, prove itself worthy of the august destiny to which it is called.

" Signed on behalf of the Provisional Government,

THOMAS J. CLARKE.

SEAN MAC DIARMADA	THOMAS MCDONEGH
P. H. PEARSE	EAMONN CEANNT
JAMES CONNOLLY	JOSEPH PLUNKETT "

For six days the rebels withstood the onslaught of the British troops. On April 29, at 3.45 p.m., when the situation was hopeless they surrendered, the President, P. H. Pearse, issuing the following instruction :

> In order to prevent the further slaughter of Dublin citizens, and in the hope of saving the lives of our followers now surrounded and hopelessly outnumbered, the members of the Provisional Government present at Headquarters have agreed to an unconditional surrender, and the Commandants of the various districts in the city and country will order their comrades to lay down arms.

During those six days the heroes who took part in the rebellion wrote an indelible page in Irish and world revolutionary history. They occupied and used as headquarters the Dublin General Post Office ; other contingents attacked Dublin Castle, took over the most strategical houses and buildings in the city and encamped in St. Stephen's Green. Westland Row Station and Harcourt Street Station were in their hands, as well as the Four Courts. Bolands Mill, a highly strategical point, was well garrisoned by the rebels. Jacob's Biscuit Factory was occupied as a food base.

Military forces by the thousands were rushed from the Curragh, Belfast and England ; the Admiralty gunboat Helga came up the Liffey and bombarded Liberty Hall ; the centre of the city was a huge bonfire before the rebels were vanquished . . . temporarily as subsequent events proved.

The rebellion ended, the Government set about the job of vengeance. Fifteen leaders, P. H. Pearse, Thos. McDonagh, Thos. J. Clarke, Joseph Plunkett, James Connolly, Edmund Kent, John McDermiodt, the signatories to the proclamation, and Edward Daly, Wm. Pearse, Cornelius Colbert, J. J. Heuston, Michael O'Haurahan, John McBride, Michael Mallin and Thomas Kent were executed.

Among others, Countess Markieviciz (known as the Red Countess) and Eamonn de Valera who were sentenced to death had their sentences commuted to penal servitude for life.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Over 3,000 prisoners were taken, the majority of whom were sent to Britain for internment. Many defenceless people were murdered by the troops as can be seen from the following coroner's verdict, which is typical of other verdicts during the period :

> We find that the said Patrick Bealen died from shock and hemorrhage, resulting from bullet wounds inflicted by a soldier or soldiers, in whose custody he was an unarmed and unoffending prisoner. We consider that the explanation given by the military authorities is very unsatisfactory, and we believe that if the military authorities had any inclination they could produce the officer in charge.

Possibly the most brutal coldblooded murder of the time was that of Mr. F. Sheehy Skeffington, on April 27. Sheehy Skeffington was a prominent progressive journalistic figure in Ireland. He was arrested on his way home, taken to Portobello Barracks and placed in the guardroom. Captain J. C. Bowen-Colthurst, one of the officers, although he knew that the prisoner was not an active rebel, ordered him to be taken into the courtyard and shot dead because he said he wanted to prevent the possibility of escape or an attempted rescue.

The callousness of this murder forced a court martial trial " which found Captain Bowen-Colthurst guilty of the first, third and fifth charges of murder, and also found this officer was insane at the time that he committed these acts." Of course the Captain was not executed. He was detained at His Majesty's pleasure in a criminal lunatic asylum—where he did not stay very long.

An official announcement on May 11, 1916, estimated the casualties during the rebellion as follows :—

	Killed	Wounded	Missing	Total
Military officers ..	17	46	–	63
Military other ranks ..	86	311	9	406
R.I.C. officers ..	2	–	–	2
R.I.C. other ranks ..	12	23	–	35
Dublin Metropolitan Police	3	3	–	6
Civilians and Insurgents	180	614	–	794
	300	997	9	1,306

On the 20th anniversary of Easter Week it is proper that an attempt should be made to draw lessons from the struggle. To do this, even in the inadequate manner possible in an article such as this, it is necessary to see the situation before and after the actual uprising.

It is common knowledge that for centuries the question of a struggle for independence and separation from Britain has been the dominant driving force in Irish politics, sufficient to call forth from the people unprecedented deeds of heroism and sacrifice. On successive occasions mass revolutionary movements in Ireland have been thwarted from achieving their aim by the vacillation of petty-bourgeois leaders who have either wavered or turned traitor at the crucial moment.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the years preceding Easter Week, John Redmond, Irish Nationalist leader with an almost unanimous mandate from the country, had, true to form, carried on the same wavering, manœuvring with Britain for Home Rule for Ireland. Successive General Elections in Britain returned Mr. Asquith to power pledged to give Home Rule to Ireland.

The Unionist Party, headed by Sir Edward Carson and Mr. Bonar Law, put its full weight behind a movement to prevent the passage of the Home Rule Bill. A scheme for a Provisional Government in Ulster in the event of the passage of the Home Rule Bill was endorsed by the Ulster Unionist Council on September 24, 1913. Standing behind this Provisional Government was the Ulster Volunteer Force organised in 1912 and armed by a consignment of 30,000 rifles and three million rounds of ammunition brought from Germany in the steamer Mountjoy II. and landed safely in Larne on April 24, 1914. Fred Crawford, the gunrunner on this occasion, reports (see the Life of Lord Carson by Ian Colvin, p. 363) that, when faced with signs of weakness on the part of some of the Ulster leaders, he approached Carson, the latter said: "Crawford, I'll see you through this business if I should have to go to prison for it."

The Army officers in the Curragh refused to move against the Ulster Volunteers led by Carson and the now famous Curragh Mutiny, led by Brigadier-General Gough, was the culminating point in convincing revolutionary republican Ireland that its freedom would never come through peaceful constitutional channels.

Therefore, to those who may criticise or deplore the 1916 rebellion because of its "unconstitutional" action, the above facts should be quite an enlightenment. To clinch this point let me quote from *Lenin on Britain*, page 58, where he deals with the Ulster crisis:

> The significance of this revolt of the landlords against the "All powerful" (as the liberal blockheads, especially the Liberal scholars think and have said a million times) English Parliament is extraordinarily great. March 21, 1914 will mark a world historical turning point, when the noble landlords of England, smashing the English Constitution and English law to atoms, gave an excellent lesson in class struggle.
>
> This lesson emerged from the impossibility of blunting the acuteness of the antagonisms between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie of England by means of the half-hearted, hypocritical, sickening reformist policy of the Liberals. This lesson will not be lost upon the English Labour Movement; the working class will now very quickly shake off its philistine faith in the scrap of paper that is called the English law and constitution, which the English aristocrats have torn up before the eyes of the whole people. (Written in April, 1914.)

The reply of Nationalist Ireland to the Ulster Volunteers was the formation of the National Volunteers under the direction and domination of the Parliamentary Redmondite Party.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But something of far greater significance had taken place in Dublin during the Carsonite adventures. The great 1913 General Strike, led by Jim Larkin had solidified Ireland's working class into a powerful steeled army. In reply to the provocations and assaults of the police the strikers had formed the Irish Citizen Army with Captain James White as instructor. All honest and sincere intellectual and middle class elements in the country came out on the side of the strikers and we had the spectacle of an entire populace solidly together, fighting against the attempt of Irish capitalism to enslave the people.

The significance of this Strike and the formation of the I.C.A. cannot be overemphasised, in connection with the Easter Week and all subsequent revolutionary occurrences in Ireland. Redmond and his Nationalist Party was at its height. Home Rule looked a certainty, despite Carson's opposition. A General Strike of Dublin workers was a new feature.

Let us once again turn to Lenin to verify this :

> At the present moment the Irish Nationalists (*i.e.*, the Irish bourgeoisie) are the victors ; they are buying out their land from the Irish landlords ; they are receiving *Home Rule* (the notorious home rule for which the long and stubborn struggle has been waged between Ireland and England) ; they will freely govern " their " land in conjunction with " their " Irish priests.
>
> And this Nationalist Irish bourgeoisie is celebrating its " national " victory, its " State " maturity by declaring a war of life and death against the Irish Labour Movement . . . . (p. 127.)
>
> The Dublin events mark a turning point in the history of the Labour Movement and of Socialism in Ireland. Murphy threatened to destroy the Irish labour unions. He only succeeded in destroying the last remnants of the influence of the Nationalist Irish bourgeoisie over the proletariat in Ireland. He has helped to harden an independent, revolutionary labour movement in Ireland, free from nationalist prejudices. (*Lenin on Britain*, pp. 129.)

The disillusionment of the working class and republican forces in Ireland, with the Nationalist Party was not yet complete. True the basis had been laid, but much water flowed beneath the bridge before the final disillusionment was achieved.

For some time after the 1913 strike the I.C.A. and the National Volunteers competed for the support of the masses of workers. The Volunteers having the most powerful organisation, and being supported by the Parliamentary leaders, soon gained the leading position so far at least as numbers were concerned. For some time this competition brought sharp ill-feeling between the two organisations.

The essential difference between the two organisations was that of labour and nationalism. There did not seem to be any clear ideas at the time as to how, and on what issues Labour-Nationalist unity could be achieved. However, with the definite split of the Volunteer movement

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into the National Volunteers under the domination of the Parliamentary Party, and the Irish Volunteers under the direction of the original Executive Committee, the breach was somewhat healed. The I.C.A., now led by James Connolly (Larkin had gone on tour to America), welcomed the Irish Volunteers for their action. And at the Emmett Anniversary held on October 25, organised by the Irish Volunteers, the I.C.A. attended in full strength.

With the outbreak of war in August, 1914, and the attempt by Redmond to swing the Irish people in behind the Imperialist war plans, the Volunteer movement moved further away from the Parliamentary Party and closer to the I.C.A. And James Connolly, clear-sighted revolutionary that he was, did everything in his power to bind that unity still closer.

Because of this, Connolly has been a very much misunderstood man. Sean O'Casey, first secretary of the I.C.A., in his valuable pamphlet, "The Story of the I.C.A.," writes:

> It is difficult to understand the almost revolutionary change that was manifesting itself in Connolly's nature. The Labour Movement seemed to be regarded by him as a decrescent force, while the essence of Nationalism began to assume the finest elements of his nature. His articles . . . speeches . . . all proclaimed that Jim Connolly had slipped from the narrow byway of Irish Socialism on to the broad and crowded highway of Irish Nationalism. The vision of the suffering worlds' humanity was shadowed by the nearer oppression of his own people, and in a few brief months pressed into a hidden corner of his soul the accumulated thoughts of a lifetime and opened his broad heart to ideas that altered the active trend of his being. The high creed of Irish Nationalism became his daily rosary, while the higher creed of international humanity that had so long bubbled from his eloquent lips was silent for ever, and Irish Labour lost a leader.
>
> A well known author has declared that Connolly was the first martyr for Irish Socialism; but Connolly was no more an Irish Socialist martyr than Robert Emmett, P. H. Pearse, or Theobold Wolfe Tone. (Page 52.)

When a sympathetic writer can write thus about Connolly it is no wonder that Connolly himself should have said to his daughter Nora on the eve of his execution—"The Socialists will never understand why I am here. They all forget I am an Irishman." (*The Irish Labour Movement*, by Wm. Ryan, p. 276.)

It is around this question that the working class must learn its biggest lesson from Connolly and Easter Week. That it was no accident that brought him on to the streets in Easter Week; that it was not the passing of a Socialist, can be seen from his article in the Glasgow *Forward*, August 22, 1914, when he says:

> The war of a subject nation for independence, for its right to live its own life in its own way, may and can be justified as holy and righteous, the war of a subject class to free itself from the debasing conditions of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> economic and political slavery should at all times choose its own weapons and esteem all as sacred instruments of righteousness ; but the war of nation against nation in the interest of royal freebooters and cosmopolitan brigands is an accursed thing.

The week previously in the same Glasgow *Forward* Connolly wrote :

> I make no war on patriotism, never have done. But against the patriotism of capitalism—the patriotism which makes the interest of capitalism the supreme test of right and duty—I place the patriotism of the working class, the patriotism which judges every public act by its effect on the fortunes of those who toil. That which is good for the working class I esteem patriotic....
>
> I regard each nation as the possessor of a definite contribution to the common stock of civilisation, and I regard the capitalist class of each nation as being the logical and natural enemy of the national culture which constitutes that definite contribution. Therefore the stronger I am in my affection for national tradition, literature, language and sympathies, the more firmly rooted am I in my opposition to that capitalist class which in its soulless lust for power and gold would bronze the nations as in a mortar.

It must be clear to all to-day that instead of signifying the passing of a Socialist, Connolly's energetic drive to bring about Republican Labour unity leading up to the 1916 rebellion, signified the coming of age of revolutionary socialism in the English-speaking world. Connolly showed himself to be a Marxist who had already grasped the significance of revolutionary national struggles in the fight against Imperialism. Connolly's clarity, vision, courage and steadfastness brought about the Easter rebellion, the first revolutionary uprising in the new period of wars and revolutions, heralded by the last world war and which already has seen the success of the Russian Revolution.

Alas, Connolly and those Republican Labour forces who went to battle with him had to pay a dear price for the wavering of their petty bourgeois associates. The rising was planned on a nation-wide scale. Dress rehearsals, as it were, had been held throughout Ireland on St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1916, when the Volunteers paraded through many towns and villages. Connolly and the I.C.A., although the leading driving force for the rebellion, were in a minority in the higher councils. To be successful, there had to be simultaneous risings everywhere—and these were planned in advance.

The arrest of Sir Roger Casement on April 21, 1916, was a set back for the movement, both from an organisational and psychological point of view. Taking place as it did on the eve of the uprising the arrest to some extent warned the Government that something was afoot although it is true to say they already had a general idea that trouble was brewing.

It will be as well here to answer those who have thrown the charge of pro-German at the rebels to give a quotation from Casement's speech at the trial :

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> But there are misstatements given in the evidence against me which I shall refute. First—I never at any time advised Irishmen to fight with Turks against Russians, nor to fight with the Germans on the western front. Second—I have already claimed that he has no right to fight for any land but Ireland. . . . Fourth—There is a widespread imputation of German gold. I owe it to those in Ireland who are assailed with me on this very ground to nail this lie once for all. . . . Those who know me know the incredibility of this malicious invention. They know from my past record that I have never sold myself to any man or any Government. From the first moment I landed on the Continent until I returned to Ireland I neither asked nor accepted a single penny of foreign money, either for myself or for any Irish cause nor for any purpose whatever, but only the money of Irishmen. I refute so obvious a slander because it was so often made until I came back.

Casement was found guilty of treason and executed in Pentonville prison on Thursday, August 3, 1916. A contemporary example of Britain's generosity is given in its recent refusal of the request of the Fianna Fail Government for the body of Casement, which they desired to bury with honour in Ireland.

The rebellion suffered its most severe blow on Easter Sunday, the day before the scheduled uprising. Arrangements had been made for the Volunteers to hold Easter manœuvres in all parts of Ireland. These manœuvres, bringing the entire insurgent military force into action in a disciplined military form on Easter Sunday, would have changed the whole history of Ireland had they taken place.

Unfortunately, the Volunteers were thunderstruck on Sunday, April 23, when they took up their Sunday papers to read the following notice :

> Owing to the very critical situation, all orders given to Irish Volunteers for to-morrow, Easter Sunday, are hereby rescinded, and no parades, marches, or other movements of Irish Volunteers will take place. Each individual volunteer will obey this order strictly in every particular.
>
> Signed, Eion MacNeill, Chief of Staff.

The confusion resulting from this order disorganised the rebel forces and left Dublin, where Connolly and the I.C.A. were the dominant force, to bear the full brunt of the rising. This was undoubtedly a major weakness.

It must also be noted that the people at large had no clear idea as to what was afoot. No real attempt was made to organise the masses of people to come in behind the rebel forces. It was in such a situation that Eamonn de Valera could correctly say " If only the people had come out with knives and forks."

To those Socialists, who for any reason (ranging from disapproval of " armed rebellion," to the theory that the rebellion was a putsch), still fail to see the tremendous significance and importance of the Easter

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rebellion allow me once more to return to Lenin, that master revolutionary who speaks with authority :

> The last issue of the *Socialist Review* (September, 1916), the organ of the Independent Labour Party, on page 205, in an editorial, we read the following declaration : " We do not approve of the Sinn Fein rebellion (the Irish Rebellion of 1916). We do not approve of armed rebellion, or of any other form of militarism and war." Is it necessary to prove that these " anti-militarists " and *similar* supporters of disarmament, not in a small nation but in a Great Power are pernicious opportunists ? (October, 1916.) (*Lenin on Britain*, pp. 164.)
>
> The century-old Irish National Movement, having passed through various stages and combinations of class interests, expressed itself, *inter alia*, in a mass Irish National Congress in America (see *Vorwarts*, March 20, 1916), which passed a resolution calling for Irish Independence —it expressed itself in street fighting, conducted by a section of the urban petty bourgeoisie and *a section of the workers* after a long period of mass agitation, demonstrations, suppression of papers, etc. Whoever calls such an uprising a " putsch " is either a hardened reactionary or a doctrinaire, who is hopelessly incapable of picturing to himself a social revolution as a living phenomena.
>
> To imagine that a social revolution is conceivable without revolts of small nations in the colonies and in Europe, without the revolutionary outbursts of a section of the petty bourgeoisie *with all its prejudices*, without the movement of non-class conscious proletarian and semi-proletarian masses against the oppression of the landlords, the church, the monarchy, the foreign yoke, etc.—to imagine that is tantamount to *repudiating social revolution.* Only those who imagine " that in one place an army will line up and say ' we are for socialism,' and in another place, another army will say ' we are for imperialism,' and believe that this will be the social revolution, only those who hold such a ridiculously pedantic opinion could vilify the Irish Rebellion by calling it a ' putsch.' " (Emphasis Lenin's.) (*Lenin on Britain*, p. 166.)

The spark of Easter Week, 1916, dormant for a period, burst out into a blazing fire in the years 1919-22. Unfortunately there was no Connolly and no virile working class leadership working in close harmony and unity with the Republican forces. The petty-bourgeoisie and bourgeoisie of Ireland headed all the republican forces. The heroic struggle against the Black and Tans drove Imperialism to the wall. When victory was once more in sight there came the division over the Treaty.

For two years after the signing of the Treaty when Mr. Cosgrave was in power, the country passed through the bitter experience of Civil War which terminated in the official execution of the " 77 " Republicans by the Cosgrave murder régime. For ten years until 1931, Cosgrave ruled Ireland with an iron hand in the interests of his Imperialist masters, and the big ranchers.

In 1932 the Fianna Fail Party, headed by Mr. de Valera, swept Cosgrave out of office on the breast of a rising wave of popular indignation supported by rising Irish capitalism and the petty bourgeoisie.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Since 1932 Mr. de Valera has broken many of the main rings of Imperialist oppression. He has abolished the Annuity Payments, abolished the Oath, made the Governor-General a mere figurehead, abolished the Senate, carried through the Irish Citizenship Law, prepared for the introduction of a new constitution, and is already in the midst of preliminary negotiations for a "settlement" with Britain.

During the same period Mr. de Valera has poured millions of pounds in subsidies into the hands of Irish capitalists in pursuit of his policy of industrialisation, he has more than quadrupled the wheat acreage of the country. On top of this he has instituted a drive against the working class and republican movements. His Conditions of Employment Bill practically introduces compulsory arbitration and relegates women to a secondary position to men in industry. The Free State Army has been used in an endeavour to defeat the Tram and Bus strikers. The unemployed are faced with forced labour under a new Bill that will come before the Dail this year. The Irish Republican Army has been attacked as much if not more so than under Cosgrave. "*An Phoblacht*" official I.R.A. paper was censored out of existence and hundreds of I.R.A. men imprisoned.

All this has brought Ireland to the position where to-day it is recognised that the differences between Mr. de Valera and Mr. Cosgrave's Party are considerably narrowed, while the difference between the workers and farmers, labour and republican adherents, and both capitalist parties have reached breaking point.

The Irish Labour Party in conference this year has recognised this, and in line with the general rising feeling throughout the country for Republican Labour unity has for the first time in years taken a stand for the complete independence of the country and the Workers' Republic.

The Republican Movement (I.R.A.) has lost heavily among those elements who see in the policy being pursued by Mr. de Valera, the achievement of the independence they were looking for. Its leadership is wavering and doing little to mobilize the large number of republican masses who still have faith in the I.R.A., but who to-day demand that the Republic for which they fight shall be one wherein the masses of the people, and not the ranchers and capitalists, will get the benefits.

On this 20th Anniversary of Easter Week we must again study the lessons it holds. Labour Republican unity is the key. Not a fight for a bourgeois republic, but a fight for a Workers' and Farmers' Republic which alone can guarantee an Independent Ireland. That is the lesson we must drive home on this anniversary.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PROBLEM OF AFRICAN INDEPENDENCE

An Answer to a Reader's Criticism

By H. RATHBONE

(Concluded.)

[*This is the concluding portion of an article, the first part of which was published in the March issue (pp. 161-172). It is in the form of an answer to a criticism by Geoffrey Gorer, the author of "Africa Dances," of a review of that book which was published in the November issue of the* LABOUR MONTHLY *last year. Geoffrey Gorer's letter will be found in full in the March issue: as the writer stated in reply, "the central question raised by our correspondent is whether the policy of full independence is a practical policy for the peoples of the African colonies, whether in the words of the review, 'their independence is a primary condition for the improvement of conditions there.'" The writer in dealing with this raised in the first part of his article the question as to whether extreme colonial exploitation is not the very essence of imperialism. Proceeding from this he examined the so-called backwardness of the African peoples, and to prove that their reputed backwardness is really based on a complete underestimation of their capabilities, he reviewed the recent struggles of the Nigerian and Gold Coast peoples. This review of these struggles in other parts of Africa he continues in this concluding section.*]

Kenya and the Right to Form Trade Unions

LET us take East Africa, Kenya for example. Here for many years any sign of independent combination among the mass of people in the tribal areas, let alone those forced to work on the farms and in the towns has been suppressed. For instance, there is the case of Harry Thuku, who attempted to form a trade union in 1921. This union, first under the name of the East African Native Association, was formed primarily to fight against a $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. reduction in wages which the settler employers suddenly announced they were going to impose. The Association was declared illegal, but was soon revived in a legal form under the name of the Kikuyu Central Association. So strong did it become that the Government took action by arresting Thuku under the Removal of Natives Ordinance, 1909, which empowers the Government to deport

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any native suspected of sedition from one part of the country to another and hold him there without trial. However, Thuku was not immediately deported, but placed in a jail in the capital of Kenya, Nairobi. An agitation for his release was promoted by the Association, and when a demonstration was held outside the prison, troops opened fire on it and according to an eye-witness in a letter to the *Manchester Guardian* of March 20th, 1929, 150 were killed, though the Government asserted that the number was only eighteen. Thuku was then deported and wholesale arrests were made, and under the Masters' and Servants' Ordinance many others were fined 10s. to 20s. for having absented themselves from work without their employers' permission (such fines would represent in some cases from three to four months' wages).

The Kikuyu Central Association survived though in a semi-illegal form. Its programme has been declared "revolutionary" and "bolshevism," though it contained, *e.g.*, in its 1929-30 programme submitted to the Government for the latter's commentary only such demands as (*a*) individual titles in land; (*b*) no encroachment on land already reserved; (*c*) no interference by Government District Officers in Native Councils; (*d*) permission to plant economic crops to be granted; (*e*) native representation by Africans as well as by Europeans on the Legislative Council and on the Municipal Council; (*f*) primary compulsory education; (*g*) the abolition of the Kipandi system whereby all native workers are compelled to carry registration cards or passes; (*h*) the recognition of only one chief for the Kikuyu tribe who should rule according to native custom; and (*i*) the establishment of a Central Native Council with representatives from the various tribes to act as a "consulting medium" between the Government and the natives.

At one time, though treated as an illegal organisation, the Association was able to work openly though very restricted in its activities, but immediately it tried to get into touch with bodies outside of Kenya the Government came down on it and hamstrung its organisation by passing an Ordinance prohibiting the collection of subscriptions by bodies except those recognised by the Government and also prohibiting the assembly of more than five persons together, except an official, euphemistically called an interpreter, was present. The Association has always regarded such so-called interpreters as just government spies.

Now what has been the reaction to these developments in England by, for instance, the Labour Party? Even a demand for the return of Harry Thuku, the leader of the Kenya African workers, to organise themselves in a trade union was not for a long time taken up, and it was only when obviously the Government agents from Kenya had at last found means of making him innocuous that the Labour Government finally conceded his release and return, only to go back into complete obscurity as far as is known. But on no occasion have they ever demanded

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the repeal of the Masters' and Servants' Act by which any activities in organising the African workers in trade unions similar to those of Harry Thuku could be carried on. True, they have in their statement on Colonial Policy a paragraph saying that all African workers should have the right to organise in a trade union. But in practice they completely ignore the efforts of Africans themselves in this and in other cases, *e.g.*, in Sierre Leone, to organise by trying to procure the repeal of the Masters' and Servants' Acts or in actively supporting a strike movement when it takes place. Even in Bathurst, Gambia Colony, when in 1928 the workers tried to organise and had a demonstration which the police broke up, it was only after protest had been organised apart from the Labour Party that the Labour Government even deigned to seek information and then only from official quarters, completely ignoring the Union.

Further, we have to say that the Labour Party has given no support whatever to the demands of the Kikuyu Central Association. It is certainly true that they passed, on the recommendation of a previously appointed Government Commission, the famous Land Trust Ordinance by which the existing reserves in East Africa were guaranteed to the Africans " for ever," a solemn pledge which was so hypocritically broken by the last National Government immediately gold was found in the reserves. But when this Ordinance had been promulgated they took no steps to encourage the Kikuyu Central Association, but carried on as a Labour Government the same practices of administration as before.

Here in Kenya also is a striking example of the attitude of the British Government towards the implementing of their so-called trusteeship of the Africans. This example shows how, while they profess to regard the Africans as a backward race that must be progressively led forward to the point when the Africans might be graciously granted a *measure* of self-government, they are actively blocking the Africans' own efforts to obtain any education, which presumably the imperialists would say the lack of which was preventing them from moving forward out of their so-called backwardness.

Indeed, we find in the Report of the Native Affairs Department for 1931 for Kenya on page 75, the statement that " perhaps one of the principal handicaps at present is lack of education." That this is nothing but a hypocritically pious statement is shown by the following remarks taken from this self-same report but twenty pages earlier. After admitting that the demand for the extension of education was " widespread and insistent," especially in certain populous districts, it went on to say :

> The demand also was for independent schools, and the main objection to such schools was the difficulty of exercising proper supervision and control. *Offers to subscribe both capital cost and full maintenance from Local Native Councils or private sources were numerous* and rendered the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> position for Government most difficult, because the Government thought it essential to have entire control of these schools, but owing to the serious financial crisis it could not contemplate further contributions from central funds (page 52) (our emphasis, H.R.).

Because the Government refused to expend the salary of even one extra inspector—assuming that even that was necessary—though the schools were going to be built and run without a penny coming from the Government funds, the ban on any further education was maintained. This is quite apart from the fact that the despotic nature of the rule of British imperialism in this colony is revealed by this Government refusal to allow any school in the colony to exist except it be under their own direct control.

This example fits in well with the well-known fact that the funds set aside for education in all the colonies of Africa is a miserable proportion of the whole resulting in only an infinitesimal fraction of the population getting any education at all. Here again, the Labour Party and the Labour Government have failed even to carry out what lay behind their Hastings policy statement and initiate any campaign for more educational facilities.

Here also the Labour Party is only logically carrying out its fundamentally incorrect policy. For if Africans are too backward to govern themselves, obviously they cannot control their own schools, obviously they cannot have their own legislative assembly, etc., or even have representation in the existing assembly. The system whereby the present Legislative Assemblies are empowered to look after the interests of the natives on the advice of one or two members who are appointed for that purpose (but actually, in practice, who do the very opposite) becomes in fact, the Labour Party policy even though its statements as in the Hastings Conference Report on Colonial Policy are of a very different character. Consequently, to all intents and purposes the existing official colonial policy is its policy with the result that not only is the Labour Party altogether out of touch with any Colonial movement, but secondly the white administrators in these colonies tend no longer to feel uncertain as to whether they will be backed up by a Labour Government in carrying out the usual policy, and what is more they can afford to ignore the Labour Party policy altogether.

Bechuanaland and Unequal Justice

Now take the position in Bechuanaland. The agitation will be recalled that arose around Chief Tshekedi's refusal to hand over those responsible for the flogging of a decadent Britisher in 1933. It will be remembered how, as a result of this, the whole question of the status of the British Protectorates in South African came up for discussion and how there was a great agitation developed for the handing over of these Protectorates

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the Union of South Africa. On the other hand, a whole section—a section which, in the end, temporarily proved the most vital—were for their retention on the ground that the South African Government could not be relied upon to carry through the duties of " trusteeship " which they said Great Britain had undertaken when it had declared protectorates over them. Quite apart from the fact that existing conditions in the Protectorates could not very well be much worse even if they were handed over to South Africa—conditions which force 40 to 60 per cent. of the total male able-bodied population always to be outside the Protectorates seeking a living for themselves in the mines of South Africa and Rhodesia, etc., and buying food to send back to their people in those predominantly agricultural countries to prevent them from starving—quite apart from these conditions being well known here (it was, in fact, a candidate of the Labour Party in the recent General Election, Leonard Barnes, who himself exposed these facts in his book, *The Second Boer War*), again the Labour Party sided with those who desired the retention of these Protectorates by Britain and openly proclaimed their opposition to handing them over to the South African Union.

On the other hand, the peoples of the Protectorates themselves do not appear to have ever been consulted as to whether or not they would prefer neither of these two alternatives, but rather whether they would desire complete independence. The LABOUR MONTHLY at the end of 1933 in the December issue published an article entitled " The Events in Bechuanaland " in support of this latter policy. The writer of the article urged that while Tshekedi was known to be probably preparing a sell-out in the sense of agreeing to a still more stringent exploitation of the people, the masses in Bechuanaland, he pointed out, and in addition the workers here, must be on their guard against any such sell-out, such as the granting of any further mining concessions in Bechuanaland to British capitalists, something which the Bechuanaland chiefs, obviously owing to the pressure from the mass of the people, had always hitherto resolutely refused to do. For any such concessions would increase the hold of the imperialists over the Protectorate. As the writer stated, in the struggle against the granting of these concessions the mass of the people would come to realise the true standing of Tshekedi and would come to see that a revolutionary anti-imperialist struggle was the only struggle that really would lead them to independence.

The Labour Party, by supporting the retention of Bechuanaland by Britain as a Protectorate was, in fact, facilitating the possible sell-out by Tshekedi which actually did happen afterwards, or rather during the period when the agitation was still on ; for he finally granted certain mining concessions over large tracts of the land. At the moment there is no news of any starting of operations on these concessions, but there is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no doubt that when this first happens, those who most put their faith in Tshekedi—and it will be remembered that it was obvious that Tshekedi had the mass of the people behind him in his original stand against Admiral Evans and his parade of force—will begin to realise that to carry through the struggle more revolutionary methods and new leaders would be needed.

South Africa and the Overcoming of Inter-Tribal Barriers

Now South Africa is in a somewhat different position to the other British African colonies owing to the fact that it is treated as a dominion and therefore the Union Government is regarded as independent of the British Government. Consequently, the latter always divests itself of responsibility for happenings in South Africa. Nevertheless, from the one fact that sixteen million pounds of direct tribute is drawn yearly by British capitalists from South Africa, quite apart from the fact that the whole of the defence of South Africa against external aggression is solely in the British Government's control, it is clear that whatever verbal shifts the British Government employs to pass on the responsibilities for the situation in South Africa, British capitalism as a whole is directly responsible for conditions in South Africa.

As is well-known, conditions for the Bantu and other non-European races in South Africa are one of the worst of any colonial country. Probably more than other African people, their freedom is restricted to an enormous extent. As was mentioned above, every feeling of hostility between one tribe and another which ever existed is sedulously kept alive by the Government. Nevertheless, such feelings have no real basis as various movements have shown—a particularly striking example being the first few years of the Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union (commonly called the I.C.U.), organised by Kadali when the workers and peasants almost altogether without regard to their tribal origin joined up and flocked around this union as they considered that here was an organisation which could stand up for their interests against the Dutch and British alike. Actually, as it turned out, Kadali was unable or unwilling to carry through the organisation and it broke up into separate parts, and now only survives as a shadow of its former self in certain districts.

This example proves, however, that whatever the obstacle of language or race may be, under certain circumstances the conditions give birth to a movement of solidarity which breaks through all these obstacles. Certain it is that, as the example of the I.C.U. has shown, the desire for common struggle is often much greater than the existing forces capable of carrying it through in an organised fashion ; nevertheless, this is no argument for not persisting and learning from former mistakes.

I give just this one example from South Africa, and it seems to me to supply overwhelming proof that there exists the possibility in South

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Africa as in every other colony, in spite of the obstacles that are put in their way, of Africans uniting. Yet many other examples could be given to-day of this possibility existing on a still more extensive scale such as around the issues of the fight against fascism (the Greyshirts), for the equalisation of wages, against the innumerable discriminatory laws, and especially against the two new Native Bills now before Parliament.

The Armed Forces the First Specific to Crush all Protest

As we have shown in the examples we have given, any attempt at organised struggle, however elementary, has been met with the full armed forces of imperialist rule, and there has been no hesitation in endeavouring to break up or illegalise any organisation whenever its formation has been attempted.

Last year, in South Africa, there occurred quite a relatively small but analogous example of this. Some native South African workers in the new state steelworks in Pretoria dared to leave their work in order, as their spokesman put it in a subsequent court proceedings, to insist on a definite reply to their request for a higher rate of pay ; he stated that they were at present getting 2s. 6d. per shift and that they desired a rise of 6d. a shift. All 29 were arrested and tried for breaking their contracts under the Masters' and Servants' Act. The magistrate, in condemning them to a fine of 5s. each, read them the following lecture : " You think you can dictate to white people at the steelworks. You had better be careful " (*Johannesburg Star*, April 26, 1935). This example has added significance, for since then the magistrate's threat has so far proved an empty one in face of what we understand is now nearing a hundred per cent. organisation of these native steelworkers in a union of their own.

Large scale examples of this use of force are seen from the fact that troops were called out on several occasions in Kenya at the time when Harry Thuku was arrested and many of those who were demonstrating or on strike were killed and hundreds more were arrested, or from the ruthless suppression of railway workers in Sierre Leone when they tried to organise their union in 1926. Or more recently still against the Rhodesian copper miners when they dared to strike in protest against a sudden 50 to 100 per cent. increase in their taxation. Not only were these armed forces used to suppress the demonstration or strike in these cases and to shoot down and make wholesale arrests, but under the shadow of the bayonets of imperialism all efforts were made to carry through and try and ensure that every vestige of organisation was broken up.

All Strikes Must Lead to Violence, Say the Government

The case of the strike against increased taxation in the Northern Rhodesia Copper Belt is especially significant from several points of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

view. Here it was obvious from the Report of Enquiry that the Government was taken completely by surprise not only by the mass nature of the strike, but also by its organisation and solidarity whatever tribe the Africans belonged to or language they spoke and to the fact that as the Report repeatedly states no damage was done to property or indeed any assault committed on European women, the latter of which they especially seem to have expected, in spite of the fact that for a time the Africans were completely in control of some of the areas and had a free run of the mine property. The Report states that the strike was " entirely unexpected by the Government " (page 58), though they themselves admit that they :

> Cannot help sympathising with the feelings of the natives when they were informed in the middle of the year that their tax had been increased retrospectively (*i.e.*, from the beginning of the year, H.R.) ; such an action amongst income-tax payers has been known to give rise to lively protests (page 33).

Yet, in spite of this professed sympathy for the strikers, they find that the firing by which at least six Africans were killed was justified !

We find elsewhere in the Report the real reason for the justification of these murders. For as a result of their investigation into the firing, one of their findings is the following significant statement :

> *It is clear that any serious strike among natives at the mines must for many years resolve itself into a strike with violence.*

Here, if anywhere, it is made crystal clear that such is the degree of exploitation, such is the necessity to maintain it at this intense level that any protest against it by the workers must at all costs be crushed. This comes well indeed from gentlemen who have just prided themselves on repeatedly drawing attention to the restraint of the strikers and to the fact that practically no damage was done to the mines as was mentioned above, as evidence of the good and " friendly " relations which they assert exist between the African workers and the European mine managers and other staff. Friends, indeed, when these workers give of their surplus labour for the " high " wage (in the words of the Report) —of an average of 5s. 10d. a week. But when four times more than this weekly amount is yearly deducted in direct taxation and the African protests, friendly relations *must* give place to violence ; any African who persists *must* necessarily be shot.

One last important point that came out as a result of this strike—the joint organisation of which between the three mines at least sixty miles in all apart being maintained by bicycle pickets—was the fact that Government apparently dared not make use of the usual Masters' and Servants' Ordinance which of course exists in this colony. All those arrested were apparently convicted of " rioting " or " incitement to riot "—the temper of the Africans, their consciousness of the necessity for joint and organised

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strike action obviously forcing an unprepared Government to treat this Ordinance, which seeks to prohibit any worker from leaving his employment without his employer's permission, as a dead letter. It reinforces our argument that the struggle and its degree of success will force in a like degree the Government to retreat.

Repression with Violence the Rule

Nevertheless, the local Governments persist in employing in all these African colonies of Britain every possible means to prevent any independent organisation or movement towards solidarity. South African legislation abounds in every sort of law buttressed up by unwritten customs which in every direction fetter the freedom of the native South African. The latest new attempt to abolish the franchise in the Cape province in South Africa for the limited number of the native population which pass the stringent qualifications as laid down in the Act of Union, is an example there of this developing process. Moreover, in the Bill which the Government have introduced to substitute for this franchise a system of advisory councils for the Negro peoples, they have taken the opportunity to try and dove-tail it in with other restrictive legislation. For instance, a conviction under the Riotous Assemblies Act is to be considered a disqualification from being a member of these so-called councils, which are to be set up under the indirect method of election in this Bill. Now this Riotous Assemblies Act, passed a few years ago, gives the Minister of Justice in person power to sanction the deportation from one part of South Africa to another of anyone he considers as " stirring up hatred " between the different races in South Africa.[3] The result is that anyone who takes part in organising native South Africans is liable to be had up under this Act and his movements by a series of convictions finally completely restricted ; already, several people in South Africa have only two provinces out of the four in which they can move freely as a result of this Act. The series of Pass laws, the Urban Areas Act, the Colour Bar Act, all these and many more have their different ways of restricting the liberty of the Africans. A similar process, though not as yet so developed and intricate, is growing up in all the other colonies.

Parallel to this legal restriction, the African in all sorts of ways continually finds himself up against the British Government or the white population generally because of his colour. In South Africa, for instance in Johannesburg, the natives can only use special trams and from most

[3]This Act, by the way, in this is like the much older Removal of Natives Ordinance of Kenya that was employed as mentioned above against Thuku. It will be seen that the lofty condemnation of South African native policy by the British Government as in no way compatible with the " pure ideals " of the native policy pursued by British imperialism in the Colonies it directly administers, is really nothing but hot air and in this particular, this policy, so much condemned by British publicists, seems to have its origin in exactly that policy with which it is so unfavourably contrasted.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cinemas they are barred ; again, the colour bar exists against their entry into any skilled occupation, though managers in the gold mines are known to have admitted that there isn't a job in the mines which natives are not capable of performing. In many African colonies if any white agent of the Government or of any British firm is seen to admit into his house Africans as social beings, he himself is in danger of being victimised both economically and socially or at any rate of being passed over when due for promotion.

In general, every free development of African economy is prevented. There is the classical example of certain peasants in Kenya being forcibly prohibited from growing a commercial species of coffee which is suitable for sale outside the colony on the grounds that all such coffee should only be grown by the white colonisers ; several peasants a few years ago when they insisted on doing this had their plants torn up by white agents before their eyes and had no means of redress. The consequence of the whole of this restriction on commerce and industry is that there is for instance no native owned bank in the whole of the British colonies of Africa and hardly any industry at all owned by Africans apart from small trades and peddling.

The whole situation boils down to this, that at every point the African is coming to see the personification of all the difficulties he meets with in developing his own economy in the armed force of the British Government or its local agents. True, a few Africans in one or two of the colonies are recruited into the local regiments, but the British practice, particularly in the last few years, has been to disband these military units and only recruit Africans for the police force, while in certain of the colonies there is conscription for the European population into so-called "Defence" forces, openly stated to be, as for instance in Southern Rhodesia, primarily for "defence" against the African inhabitants of the colony. Consequently, when any worker strikes for higher wages and better conditions or any peasant protests against heavy taxation or against the swindles, practised by the big trusts to rob him or her of even the local market price let alone the world market price for his goods, he or she immediately comes up against the full forces of imperialism.

The Perspective of the African Revolution

For a variety of reasons, however, it must be stated that the development of African economy has lagged considerably behind the fully-developed capitalist economy of those regions with more temperate climates. For one thing, technique is only now being able to solve the barriers to economic development which the extremes of heat and of cold have formed. Added to this is the fact that imperialism has, as we have shown, deliberately stifled more comprehensively even than in almost

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any other group of colonial countries all attempts by Africans to use what possibilities the existing level of capitalist technique has hitherto offered.

The result, of course, is that the level of African economy is still low. In this very limited sense African society is backward compared to European, but as we have shown in the process of the struggle, Africans with practically no previous experiences of their own and with the meagre opportunities left open to them of learning from the struggles of the European workers and peasants, can in no sense be called inherently backward.

In consequence of this position, while advanced colonial countries such as India can very well achieve independence prior to the revolution in the imperialist countries, it must be stated that it may very well happen that the backward nature of Negro African economy *may* result in African independence being achieved *only parallel* with the revolution in imperialist countries.

This possibility lays an additional responsibility on the victorious revolutionary movement in the imperialist countries being particularly prepared to come to the assistance of the colonial peoples. By assistance, we mean that kind which the Soviet Republic of Russia proper was able to render to the republics of the former colonies of the Tsarist Empire. A sharp distinction must here be drawn between this kind of *assistance* and capitalist *exploitation* of these colonies. The victorious revolution in the imperialist countries would of course immediately recognise the absolute independent sovereignty of the colonial peoples and their right to select whatever form of government they considered best fitted to their development. At the same time the possibility of friendly assistance by a British Soviet State to the former British Colonies is immense. The lending of technicians in all branches of industry and of every kind of scientific worker, the advance to them of machinery so that they can create an industry best suited to their climate[4] and resources.

Further, the tremendous experience of the British working class on both the industrial and political fields would be invaluable to Africans, enabling them to learn to avoid the mistakes and setbacks which British workers have suffered before they reach their goal. British trade union, political and co-operative organisers would all be needed on the basis of friendly relations between the two peoples.

[4]Here we are aware of the doubts of many Africans as regards the advisability of encouraging factories in Africa. After seeing the hell many factories are in Britain, they shudder at the prospect of deliberately creating such hells in tropical Africa where their horror would be ten-fold intensified. But industrial technique has now reached such a level as would make it possible, to take one instance only, for the what might be intolerable heat in factory life in the tropics to be completely counteracted

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What can Now be Done

Isn't it obvious that, as we have pointed out in giving examples to show the stage of the struggle in several of the colonies, there is likewise tremendous room for fraternal bonds of solidarity being forged in the struggle of the two peoples *to-day*, which will prepare the way for the technical and organising assistance being offered and more readily accepted by the Africans on the victorious morrow.

As we have shown, the extreme exploitation of the Africans is the very essence of imperialism. Consequently, this means that the initial fight for the elementary rights of organisation and meeting, health, housing and education, will be met with even greater resistance than in the home countries. But driven back the imperialists can be, and the more conscious the solidarity of the British workers the more certain will be the Africans' success. Trade union and political organisers prepared in advance to stand up against all the forces of the State (remember the Rhodesian statement to the effect that it was inevitable that all large-scale colonial strikes would lead to, read must be suppressed by, violence) will be even more valuable than after the revolution. The fight for the sending of trade union and political delegations on tours of investigation like the T.U.C. delegations to Russia or to attend African conferences and congresses, the organisation of literature, both its writing-up, printing *and* despatch, offer immense fields of work.

Finally, even though we have seen that independence is a primary condition for the improvement of the Africans' conditions, this by no means involves that the struggle for the betterment of these conditions and the beating back of the yoke of imperialism from off their necks does not itself, as indeed we have shown it does, lead directly forward to the final struggle for independence.

There exists to-day a large body of opinion in the rank and file of even the Conservative, as well as the Liberal and Labour, Party who, while not prepared to recognise the right of colonies to secede, nevertheless are willing to join in protesting against the denial of the elementary rights of free speech and organisation, against the repressive measures of the Government in putting down any independent movement, however mild its nature, against the dastardly health and housing conditions, against the deliberately niggardly provision for education, against low wages and high taxation, and for above all the provision of more land to the people.

In the protests that should be made in collaboration with these people, the actual conditions of imperialism will become revealed to large masses of them and the problem of African independence will come to be a demand of urgency to them and not a utopian dream, as is regarded by many to-day, or again by many others as a practical impossibility.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Such a large body of opinion exists to-day, just because the colonial problem, owing to the question of the redistribution of colonies now being sharply put by the fascist expansionist countries like Germany, Italy and France, occupies the very centre of the international political field. Consequently, many who have previously accepted the evils of imperialism and passed them by in the face of what appeared to them more urgent problems, by the very struggle of the Abyssinians against fascist Italy are now being forced to take sides in this war of colonial liberation. Inevitably, the vast majority take the side of Abyssinia against Italian fascism and then immediately come up against the problem of the colonies of their own imperialism.

To draw these people in who now for the first time are realising that there is such a thing as a colonial problem, to join with them in protesting against any single evil or evils of capitalism, to join in demanding the elementary rights at present denied the colonial peoples, can but widen the struggle, can but advance the consciousness of wider and wider numbers to the true significance of imperialism, can but lead to similar processes in the colonies and so inevitably lead forward to the joint struggle of the vast majority of the British and Colonial people for complete independence, for complete freedom from the yoke of imperialism.

MARX MEMORIAL LIBRARY AND WORKERS' SCHOOL

SUMMER SCHOOL

SWANAGE, DORSET
AUGUST, 1936

Enjoy a seaside holiday at the Marx House Summer School for Trade Unionists, Co-operators, etc.

FROM 37/6 PER WEEK

Special lectures and discussion on current and economic problems will be arranged

Lecturers include:

PROF. H. J. LASKI PROF. H. LEVY
JOHN STRACHEY MAURICE DOBB
R. BRIDGEMAN

There will be a crèche for the children

Write for PROSPECTUS to DEPT. L.M.,
The Secretary, Marx House, Clerkenwell Green, E.C.1.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

REVOLUTION AND FREEDOM OF IDEAS.

I Will not Rest. Romain Rolland. Selwyn and Blount. pp. 320. 8s. 6d.

IN this book Romain Rolland has traced the curve in his own thought from the time of his "Above the Battle"—a deceptive title as he points out, for the boot at least begins to deny the label—to his more complete accord with the tactics and strategy of the Communist International.

His book is a case-history. Many writers and intellectuals will see their own difficulties re-lived, though lived on a more "magistral" and "morally elevated" plane (the epithets are those which Lunarcharsky applied to Rolland's criticisms). Many superior persons (there was a recent example in the Londoner's Diary of the *Evening Standard*), have offered Rolland as an example of a writer whose absorption in politics has almost put an end to his creative work. The first point made clear by Rolland's spiritual autobiography (for that is what it is) is that it is not his absorption but his struggle to keep clear, to be unidentified, to remain a conscientious objector that has made Rolland's life for nearly a decade a ceaseless mental struggle with himself, a mental struggle which is well rewarded by a perspective all the sharper for being hard won.

The darkest phase of this private struggle seems to have been reached in 1920 when, as he says, "Independence of the Mind became more than ever my banner. Yet I would not again allow that it should be used as a pretext for isolating oneself from the struggle. On the contrary I wanted that banner to fly over the proletarian battle. But how tirelessly did the proletarian soldiers themselves tear and trample upon it." Now that the world revolutionary movement, as well as Romain Rolland himself, has advanced to a new phase, it is important not to misunderstand the change that has taken place, important to disentangle, as Rolland I think does incompletely, the mistakes of individual sectarians in 1920 and afterwards, from the rightness of a policy they were applying uncomprehendingly and woodenly. Many an exponent in controversy has been so conscious of being logically in the right that he has put himself in the wrong. This happened not infrequently in the bitter controversies that ranged round Rolland's banner of the Independent Mind. But history itself joined in clearing up the problem.

The world has changed since 1920 and Rolland understands the nature of the change. "I could feel," he writes of the period 1922-1927, "the 'Storm over Europe' coming. I scented it in the air with my enfevered nostrils." At this stage—he dates it at about 1925—at this stage, "which is still that of a majority of good people of the West, the enemy is the whole of capitalised society: but it is like a vague and diffused mist, it is everywhere; and though one may get ready to meet its assaults unflinchingly one does not know precisely at what point the assault would be launched, and in what form the enemy would take shape."

"In these years," he goes on, "Italian Fascism undertook to show us the features of the enemy." The impact of Italian Fascism was felt by the intellectuals of France more than by those of the rest of Europe, who date their awakening from Hitler's arrival. "We," says Rolland, "did not have to wait until that day of 10th, May, 1933, which Karl Radek has said he believed to be decisive for the orientation of the 'humanist writers'—the day of the burnt books." As early as November, 1926, Barbusse and Rolland launched a famous appeal "To free men, Against Fascism," decisive date in the history of the forming of the People's Front.

To see Capitalist Society, not vaguely like a diffused mist, but to know precisely from what point the assault will take place,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and what form the enemy will take, is surely to step from an abstract (vague misty) understanding of capitalist development to a living knowledge of it as a process. It is this change of understanding that gets rid of the peculiar Rolland difficulties. For example, there is one formulation of them which has been raised for the intellectuals of Great Britain by a note Aldous Huxley contributed to the catalogue of the recent Artists' International Association Exhibition. Huxley, like Rolland, raised the old problem of means and ends, raised it almost in Rolland's words. This is what Rolland says (quoting his own *Clérambault*) : " It is not true that the end justifies the means. The means are even more important for true progress than the end. For the end (so rarely reached and always incompletely) but modifies the external relations between men. The means, however, shape the mind of man according either to the rhythm of justice or to the rhythm of violence. And if it is according to the latter, no form of government will ever prevent the oppression of the weak by the strong. That is why I regard it as essential to defend moral values, more perhaps during a revolution than in ordinary times. For revolutions are moulting periods, when the spirit of the nation is more susceptible to change."

This antithesis of ends and means has become a commonplace of pseudo-philosophy, but it is not an antithesis that will bear scrutiny. Men who have thought deeply on human action have always recognised an identity more than a contradiction of ends and means. Even Kant abolished the division in his supreme principle of moral philosophy, the universal law, the final categorical imperative, that human beings must be treated as ends in themselves and never as a means to another satisfaction. Hegel derived from Kant, and the Marxism that turned Dialectical Idealism upside down, placing its feet on the ground, gave body to the notion of the human being as an end in himself, and in the victorious socialism of the Soviet Union that bodily reality lives and grows before our eyes. The antithesis of ends and means comes of considering what Rolland calls moral values as existing apart from the human beings who are their embodiment. It disappears when the Metaphysic of Morals becomes the practice of building a new world.

Fascism on the one hand, Socialism victorious on the other, these are the events which, since 1920, have changed not the theory, but the course of the argument. Though Rolland still says he would endorse the formula in *Clérambault*, he gives evidence enough of a clearer eye. " There are fetish words . . . for which we are constantly ready to give up our lives . . . Free minds in every age, the Swifts and the Voltaires, have made it their business to tear off the mask. . . . . But the task must be renewed perpetually. And the lies of word-ideas, or word-idols, by becoming democratised multiply themselves." . . . " It is our task as writers . . . to put an end to this ambiguity, to disentangle energetically, after Marx, the real man from the ' abstract human being,' and to lead him to the threshold of ' true liberty ' by demonstrating, as Marx has demonstrated, the congruity or natural and logical coincidence of Communism with ' humanism.'

" When Wagner wrote his *Tristan* despairing of ever finding in Europe the public which could hear and understand it, he wrote, it is said, for an imaginary public in Rio de Janerio. The geniuses of art were forced, while they created advanced work, to create at the same time the illusion, the prevision, of a people to come who would recognise in that work its own music. The people are there, now."

Finally, let me quote this : " Recently in his interview with H. G. Wells, Stalin, soothing his petit-bourgeois apprehensions, showed him that ' there is not, there ought not to be any antagonism between the interests of the individual and of the collectivity. The two must be reconciled. Only the Socialist society can make room in the largest measure for individual interests. Socialist society represents,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moreover, the only solid guarantee of the defence of the individual's interests.' What Stalin said of interests," Rolland concludes, "he could have said—and I say it—of ideas."

MONTAGU SLATER.

A HUMAN REFORGING

The White Sea Canal. John Lane. pp. 356. 15s.

THIS book, a collective work of 32 writers, edited by Gorki, is not only a history of a victory over nature achieved by thousands of individuals with a criminal past (wreckers, thieves, prostitutes), but a history "of a victory of these individuals over themselves."

Thousands of criminals have received a new pass into life and have learned the truth of Socialism through socially useful labour.

In 1931, the Soviet Government took a decision to build this canal by means of which ships could get from the White Sea to the Baltic without going all the way round the North Cape and Norway. It took the Soviet ships 17 days to reach Leningrad from Archangel, but it was necessary to cut through 240 kilometers of rock and swamps to open a direct route. But the building of the canal would mean much more than that. It would bring new life into the Soviet North, into Karelia which has unexplored deposits of gold, copper and iron; further it meant "that the long night of the polar region was to be lighted by electricity and that where only the day before people slept in pine needles, towns with theatres and clubs were to be built." The project of this construction had been discussed several times by the Tzarist government, and, in the same way as the building of a tube in Moscow, had been rejected as "fantastic" and unworkable.

But where to get the labour for the construction? Building was going on throughout the country and nobody could be spared. But what about the thousands of men and women sent to different terms of detention in labour camps—"were they to be branded as criminals for the rest of their life?" Finally it was decided to entrust the building of the canal to the G.P.U.—about 100,000 criminals had to carry out the construction with the help, and under the supervision of 37 G.P.U. men!

The book recording this heroic fight for construction in the midst of tremendous difficulties (rocks, swamps, shortage of materials and skilled labour) shows in a very convincing and realistic way the whole process of the "reforging" of various sections of criminals and also answers the questions why and how do people start wrecking and why and how did they start work. The criminals could be roughly divided into three sections: counter revolutionaries—wreckers, kulaks and criminals.

The majority of the engineers who worked on the project of the canal, and whose names, as a result of this work, became known and honoured throughout the country, had started their wrecking

DISCUSSION

The Communist Party's new monthly for political controversy.

This publication affords an opportunity for threshing out left-wing opinion and influencing policy

Readers of the LABOUR MONTHLY will need to read and want to enter into

DISCUSSION

Price 2d.

(Subscription for six months, 1/6.)

Obtainable from

16 King St., Covent Garden, W.C.2

and at

Workers' Book Shop, Clerkenwell Green, E.C.1.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

activities because they regarded the Soviet régime as barbarism, something that could not last and from this they drew the conclusion that their task was to accelerate the downfall of the Soviets, and to preserve the property of their old masters. They started to work on the canal just because it was a relief to be able to create again. But they were reminded that "their life was not over" and that they could win liberty. Finally, their indifference to the project broke down, they were carried away by their own ideas.

It is impossible to describe the entire human gallery given in the book—many of them victims of social circumstances, thieves and gangsters who became proud of their profession and despised work, or the separate section of kulaks. Some started work because those who worked received better food and clothing and were given hot pies, others because they got fed up sitting all the day on their own in the barracks, gambling and swearing, while others were discussing production. Some of the kulaks sent to the camps for crimes of violence and the burning down of whole villages, started work to show their superiority and skill to the "scum" around them. And then you can see how the majority of these people irrespective of their first reactions and impulses, get carried away by their own work and begin to regard the construction as something of their own, something very valuable which *they* give to *their* country.

How was it achieved? The G.P.U. men realised first of all that to be able to work, people must have decent lodgings, clothing and food and this was carried out. They had an individual approach to everybody, knew how to touch the best side of every criminal, to arouse his pride.

The camp was a strange place, "the designing was done by wreckers, the financial department was run by embezzlers, etc." Socialist competition was introduced among thieves and counter revolutionaries. Scores of clubs, lectures, production conferences to make the meaning of the construction clear to everybody, were organised. Possibilities of reduction of sentences and liberation were explained. An unlimited opportunity of studying was given to everybody —the teachers were drawn from the wreckers and criminals themselves.

On the completion of the canal, 12,484 were freed as people who had entirely reformed, 59,516 had their sentences reduced. Thousands who were illiterate when they came to the camp have now learned skilled trades and are now engaged in other constructional work.

The book also shows the real rôle of the G.P.U. which not only punishes, but teaches. It shows that the first push along the new road was given to the "campers" by the straightforward, human attitude of the G.P.U. men, people of iron discipline moulded in the fight for the working class.

It is impossible to find a better comment on this "reforging" than Gorki's words at the last conference of the builders of the canal: "The dictatorship of the proletariat has once more earned the right to declare: 'I do not fight to kill as do the bourgeoisie, I fight to resurrect humanity to a new life.'"

TAMARA RUST.

A CENSORED ARTICLE

"Labour and the Glamour of the Throne" By C. H. NORMAN

Last month our printer refused to print this article. We've now issued it as a special supplement to the

April "PLEBS"

3d. (4d. post free)

"An Introduction to Dialectical Materialism"

By EDWARD CONZE

Dialectical Materialism loses its terrors when you read this stimulating book. If you want to think scientifically, this is the outline you've been waiting for.

Stiff Boards 1/-; 1/2 post free. (Cloth 2/-)

Discounts on Quantities.

N.C.L.C. Publishing Society Ltd.

15 South Hill Park Gardens, London, N.W. 3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WANTED A SIGN POST.

Man Adrift. Anthony Bertram. Chapman & Hall. pp. 323. 7s. 6d.

HERE is an intellectual who, unable to live in the clouds and write of airy nothings any longer, has become so conscious of the misery, injustice, and exploitation going on around him, that he not only believes that he must write what he sees, but that the subject matter must affect the form of the novel. It is an interesting experiment, but it is at present only an experiment.

We are presented with a cross section of life to-day, but there is too large an assortment of characters, the whole thing is too disconnected and the characters are not at all representative, being almost entirely the cranks, and odd men out.

One cannot grumble that a book entitled *Men Adrift* gives only a picture of a society that is lost, aimless and hopeless. There is not one episode in the book that gives any suggestion that the author has any faith in the power and strength of the of the working class, or that he has any knowledge of the new life of purpose that can be built up when capitalist exploitation and injustice are abolished.

While the writer ignores or cannot see this, he will certainly remain adrift, as much as any of his characters, and his writing will certainly not be a true reflection of the world as it is to-day.

D. G.

PLAN FOR BOOKBUYING. Any books you require can be yours for a few pence a week by our EASYPAYWAY. Write for interesting catalogues of "Left" literature. WORKERS' BOOKSHOP LTD., Marx House, 38 Clerkenwell Green, London, E.C.1.

[Owing to pressure of space E. Woolley's article on the significance of the Stakhanov Movement which was announced last month has had to be held over. Therefore if readers have still some doubts on this movement they can send them to reach this office not later than April 10th.]

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

Stay Down Miner. Montagu Slater. (Martin Lawrence Ltd.) 81 pp. 6s.

American Writers' Congress. Edited by Henry Hart. (Martin Lawrence Ltd.) 192 pp. 6s.

Proletarian Literature in the United States. Granville Hicks, Michael Gold, and others. Foreword by Joseph Freeman. (Martin Lawrence Ltd.) 384 pp. 7s. 6d.

Social Credit. An Economic Analysis. John Strachey. (Gollancz.) 24 pp. 3d.

U.S.S.R. Handbook. Edited by Louis Segal. (Gollancz.) 641 pp. 15s.

The Fate of the Middle Classes. Alec Brown. (Gollancz.) 288 pp. 6s.

A CORRECTION

In a review entitled *World Unemployment* on p. 187 of the March issue several minus signs were accidentally omitted from two tables, making them misleading; the following are the tables as they should have read :

AVERAGE ANNUAL INCREASE PER CENT.

GREAT BRITAIN—	1861— 1911	1924— 1929	1924— 1934
Workers employed in Industry	1.3	−0.52	−1.17
Industrial Production	1.85	2.26	0.45
Output per Head ..	0.59	2.88	1.84

U.S.A.—	1869— 1899	1899— 1913	1923— 1929
Workers employed in Industry	3.2	3.4	−1.7
Industrial Production	5.6	4.5	3.2
Output per Head ..	2.3	1.1	5.5

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Appeal Fund

OWING to the generosity of two readers, the contributions to the Debt Fund have this month reached the total of £11 12s. 4d., but this month readers will notice an alarming drop in the number of contributors.

This £11 has enabled the MONTHLY just to keep its head above water and prevent the accumulation in the total Debt, by filling in the gap between the total of the Guarantors' Fund and the total monthly deficit.

But as we warned readers last month, this is not really sufficient to carry forward the MONTHLY until its circulation rises to the extent of being able to pay its way.

The MONTHLY therefore appeals to all its readers to make special efforts in the coming months to send in whatever sum they find possible so that the Debt will soon approach liquidation.

Fill in either of the forms overleaf.

DEBT FUND.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Previously acknowledged	322	15	5	*Brought forward*	334	0	5
Hastings, Surrey ..	0	1	0	J.R.S., London, N.W. ..	0	1	0
F. S. B., London ..	5	0	0	V. H. Peper	0	2	0
M. Gawthorpe ..	0	2	0	Profits on Sales, per F.W.B.	0	2	3
C. B. Tyler	0	2	0	Halfpenny Fund, per N.	0	2	2
S. Davis, Cardiff ..	6	0	0				
Carried forward	334	0	5		£334	7	10

GUARANTEE FUND.

	£	s.	d.
Previously acknowledged	20	5	10
J.F., Johannesburg	0	10	0
	£20	15	10

In addition, two contributions of 1s. and 5s. to the Guarantee Fund have been received from Tom Paine and £2 from Onyx.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THINGS MOVE QUICKLY—

and **LABOUR MONTHLY** readers want to keep abreast of current events. The growth of Unity in France, Spain, Britain. The War moves of Fascism and the National Government. The developments in the struggle for higher wages and relief.

These things can only be followed in a **DAILY** newspaper!

AND THE ONLY PAPER WHICH KEEPS YOU FULLY INFORMED IS THE

DAILY WORKER

7d. per week from the "Daily Worker," Nelson Place, Cayton St., E.C.1., and from many Newsagents in all parts.

DEBT FUND

To the Manager, THE LABOUR MONTHLY, 7 John Street, London, W.C.1.

In response to your appeal I enclose herewith the sum of.....
as a contribution to the LABOUR MONTHLY *Debt Fund.*

Name.....

Address .....

.....

GUARANTEE FUND

To the Manager, THE LABOUR MONTHLY, 7 John Street, London, W.C.1.

I promise to send the sum of.....*monthly to the* LABOUR MONTHLY *Guarantee Fund until further notice and enclose herewith a first instalment of*.....

Name.....

Address .....

.....

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ernst Toller

LETTERS FROM PRISON

Letters written during five years imprisonment after the Bavarian revolution, to well-known poets and writers, scientists, artists, workers, women and children, intimate friends.

The book includes a new translation of 'The Swallow Book,' together with 'Songs from Prison,' some 'Poems of War,' and all the letters confiscated by the prison authorities.

The illustrations in collotype include some of Toller's documents, photographs of Toller and of his plays which were produced during this period.

TRANSLATED BY R. ELLIS ROBERTS 12/6

Karl Marx

BY FRANZ MEHRING

The first English translation, from the revised 1933 edition, of a biography which is considered on the Continent as a classic socialist work.

An appendix, prepared by Prof. Edward Fuchs, incorporates new material brought to light by the Marx-Engels Institute in Moscow.

TRANSLATED BY EDWARD FITZGERALD 15/-

the bodley head

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WE ARE BUILDERS

In these days of economic stress the foundations of many old-established businesses are in danger. These should be strengthened by the latest known and proved methods.

New businesses need special care in building, concrete is largely used—the outcome of science and experience.

High-class Publicity and Printing is the best form of concrete foundation to any business or Association.

WE ARE BUILDERS

LEICES
CO-OPE
PRINTING
SOCIE
Church Gate
Telephone

Published by the Proprietors, the Trinity Trust, 7 John Street, W.C.1, and Printed by the Leicester Co-operative Printing Society Limited, 99 Church Gate, Leicester

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED